

Vol. XXX.

JULY, 1953.

No. 3.

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 15/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. A. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Very Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughman, Kaikorai, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Adm., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rt. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Albury, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Editor:

V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

- Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 179
- Papal letter appointing Cardinal Gilroy Legate to plenary council of the Philippines—Papal Letter appointing Cardinal Gilroy legate to National Eucharistic Congress—Broadcast of Pope at conclusion of the Congress—L. Feeney declared excommunicated—Condemnation of book—Responses of the Pontifical Commission for the Code of oriental Canon Law.

BYZANTIUM—CONSTANTINOPLE—ISTANBUL,

Rev. William Keane, S.J. 186

BISHOP WILLSON, XVI.

Right Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G. 204

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 215

The Theology of the Mass, XI.

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 226

Use of confessional knowledge—Jurisdiction for confessions in Common Error—Case of Bination—Aged priest and bination—Communion at Mass after mid-day—Sick and the Eucharistic Fast—Cases of co-operation.

CANON LAW . . Right Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L. 238

Domicile of married minor—Impediment of Crime—Pauline privilege and divorced converts—Summary process for nullity of bigamous marriage.

LITURGY Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 244

Altar Wine—Blessing of Baptismal Font on the Vigil of Pentecost—Renewal of the Benediction Host—Missa Privata—Addition to the Divine Praises—New editions of the Roman Ritual and the Roman Missal.

HOMILETICS Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 250

The Assumption.

NOTES 253

The Virtue of Chastity—A Centenary of Rabelais.

BOOK REVIEWS 263

A Retreat for the Clergy, Religious and others (Hedley); *Catholic Political Thought: 1789-1848* (Menczer); *New Testament Texts; Matter, Man, and Miracle* (Newsholme); *Advent* (Daniélou); *Holy Trinity Book of Prayers* (Ryan) [p. 185]; *Of the Imitation of Christ* (Trans. McCann) [p. 249]; *Philosophical Studies* (p. 262); *De Castitate et Luxuria* (Lanza) [p. 253].

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Julii, 1953.

Official Documents

*Papal Letter appointing Cardinal Norman Thomas Gilroy Legate
a latere to the first plenary Council of the Philippines.*

(A.A.S., Vol. XXXV, p. 96)

PIUS XII POPE.

Beloved Son, Health and Apostolic Blessing—It was with very special joy that We heard of the unanimous decision of the whole Episcopate of the Philippine Islands to celebrate their first Plenary Council at the beginning of next year. The Statutes drawn up at the Provincial Council of Manila, in 1907, before the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law, no longer correspond to the remarkable growth of the Episcopal Hierarchy in those islands, nor do they fit the new conditions which have arisen since, after the conclusion of the recent war, the Archipelago of the Philippine Islands became an independent Republic. Consequently the approaching Council will be of great importance and great utility for the renewal of the religious and moral life of the Christian people. This importance may be gathered from the subjects which are to be treated in the solemn Sessions of the Council: the fostering of religion and the perfection of morals, the promotion of clerical holiness and the care of souls, the zealous provision of catechetical instruction in parishes and in public and private schools, the better direction of episcopal Curiae and diocesan offices of administration, the reformation of taxes received on the occasion of the administration of Sacraments or Sacramentals according to canonical rules, the worthy maintenance of churches, observance of liturgical laws, the work of ecclesiastical vocations, the careful education and formation of Seminarists, preaching, and the vigorous promotion of Catholic Action.

Besides, the measures are to be considered, which must be used to secure the execution of the Statutes recently approved by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation regarding the annual meetings of the Bishops (Catholic Welfare Organization), of the Decree of the same Sacred Congregation erecting a military Vicariate in the Philippine Islands, of a greater and more efficacious defence of the integrity of the Catholic faith against the repeated attempts of those dissidents who are called Aglipayans. These are the heads of discussion which We propose to the Prelates who are to gather for the Council.

In order that We ourselves may be able to preside over that plenary Assembly of Bishops according to the regulation of Canon Law, We choose and appoint you, Beloved Son, a member of the Sacred College of Cardinals and Pastor of the illustrious See of Sydney as Our Legate a latere, to represent Our person, convoking in Our name and by Our authority the first plenary Council of the whole episcopate of the Philippine Islands, and presiding over its solemn Sessions.

Meanwhile, We implore the Giver of all good gifts to guide with His light and grace from above the minds and hearts of those who will meet at Manila and bring their work to a happy issue. As an earnest of this heavenly help and as a pledge of our special charity We lovingly impart the Apostolic Benediction in the Lord to you, Beloved Son, to the Bishops of the Philippine Islands and to their flocks.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, on the 8th day of December, the feast of the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M., in the year 1952, the fourteenth of our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

* * * *

Papal Letter appointing Cardinal Norman Thomas Gilroy Legate a latere to the Australian National Eucharistic Congress of Sydney.

To Our Beloved Son,

Norman Thomas Gilroy of the title of the Four Crowned Martyrs, Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church, Archbishop of Sydney,

PIUS XII POPE.

Beloved son, Health and Apostolic Blessing:—Not without very special joy of soul did We learn that a National Eucharistic Congress is being prepared in Australia, and that the celebrations of it will take place in the chief city of that noble nation during the coming month of April. With God's help it will be a successful and happy event. We are also exceedingly glad to know that the theme which is to be developed in the solemn Sessions of the Congress is the new commandment of Christ, which He delivered to us in the words "*By this all men shall know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another*" (John XII., 35). This, indeed, is what the Redeemer of mankind willed, when He instituted the August Sacrament, by stimulating charity towards God, to foster mutual charity amongst men. Charity is a divine virtue, than which nothing can be more advantageous to the fellowship of mortals and nothing more productive of joy. Charity is not only more excellent than all other virtues, since it reaches God Himself, to remain in Him, but it is also the foundation and root on which all the

other virtues rest and are nourished. Certainly the sincere love of God and neighbour chiefly springs from the Most Holy Eucharist! The Eucharist indeed communicates charity as a burning, active virtue, because the living Christ is contained in the Eucharist and in It He revels, as it were, in His love for us. Hence that celebrated exhortation of the Council of Trent, breathing a wondrous charity and loving-kindness: "The Holy Synod admonishes with paternal affection, exhorts, begs and implores, through the tender mercy of our God, that all and each of those who are called by the name of Christian may at last find union and unanimity in this sign of unity, in this bond of charity, in this symbol of concord" (Sess. XIII, de Euch. C.VIII).

Therefore, desiring nothing more earnestly than that the hearts of the faithful through intimate union with Christ may be bound together in the closest bonds of fraternity, and that they may in this way contribute greatly to the concord and prosperity of all their fellow citizens, We desire also to be joined to this coming Eucharistic Congress of the Australian nation, not only with the intimate feelings of Our heart, but also by Our presence at it through a Legate. We, therefore, choose and appoint you, Beloved Son, as Our Legate a latere, for you are invested with the splendour of the Roman Purple and hold the pastoral office in the illustrious See of Australia's chief city. You will preside over the Eucharistic Congress of the whole Australian nation, to be held next April, in Our name and by Our authority. We are sure that, in accordance with the piety and zeal with which you are adorned, you will fulfil this honorific office usefully and happily. For its successful issue and as a harbinger of abundant fruits, as well as an attestation of Our special love, let the Apostolic Benediction be yours, and most lovingly in the Lord We hereby impart it to you, Beloved Son, to the clergy and people committed to your care as well as to all who will take part in the Sacred Solemnities.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the 24th day of the month of March, 1953, in the fifteenth year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

* * * *

BROADCAST OF OUR HOLY FATHER PIUS XII

to the faithful of Australia gathered in the city of Sydney for an Eucharistic Congress (Apr. 19, 1953).

(A.A.S., XXXV, No. 6, May 25, 1953).

This is a day of remembrance for you, our dearly beloved children of Australia—of blessed memories that stir the soul to songs of praise

and thanksgiving to God. Our beloved son, your esteemed Cardinal Archbishop, is with you as our personal Legate, so that you may know how close we are to you in your jubilee celebration.

One hundred and fifty years ago the first public Holy Mass was offered on your shores; and one can well imagine the deeply felt emotions of the Sacrament-hungry exiles, when they were at last granted their most prized privilege, to bow in adoration before the Divine Victim of Golgotha, raised aloft in the hands of their priest. Their Eucharistic Lord was with them again. The Holy Mass had forged a link, uniting them with their dear ones far overseas, and, surely, the hills and dales of their native land were heard to echo the joy that filled their hearts.

Twenty-five years ago, beloved children, you commemorated this momentous event in Australian history. Amid a grand concourse of the faithful, from far and near, with colourful pageantry, in learned gatherings of prelates and the laity, and finally under the inspiration of the solemn soul-uplifting liturgy of the Church you gave magnificent public profession of your faith and gratitude to the Divine Bounty. And who will count all the graces and blessings, that over the decades, since that first Holy Sacrifice, have flowed into the souls of men from the altars erected in the four quarters of your continent?

The Mass, your daily Mass, carries the memory back far beyond the brief span of a century and a half. It transports you in spirit to "a large upper room, furnished", of a house in Jerusalem. It is Thursday night, nearly two thousand years ago. Jesus had eaten the paschal lamb with His Apostles. "Then He took bread and blessed and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, This is My Body, which is to be given for you; do this in remembrance of Me. And so with the cup, when supper was ended. This cup, He said, is the new testament in My blood which is to be shed for you".

On that traitorous, yet never so triumphant Holy Thursday night, the Sacred Heart of Jesus was asking us all, through the Apostles, on whom He was to found His Church, to remember the sacrifice He so lovingly, so eagerly even, accepted for our salvation; to commemorate it all days, from the rising of the sun to the setting of the same, down through the ages and across the five continents of His kingdom on earth.

And how staunchly Australia's priests and people have remembered! There, for the world to read and heed, is the story of your abiding devotion to the Holy Mass through the arduous pioneer years

of your national life. Here, for the world to see and hear, in this hour of abundant grace and opportunity, is the vast congress of your sons and daughters, young and old, gathered about the Saviour's banquet table to offer and share once more that single Eucharistic sacrifice, to eat this pasch with their Risen King.

But let the world realise with us, for its further consolation and assurance, that you are assembled here in prayerful, apostolic readiness for much more than a feast of remembrance. This is a solemn hour of resolution, too! For Australia, as for every nation in the Lord's great family of souls, Jesus Christ can be no mere memory, however tenderly and tenaciously enshrined in the pages of our history.

Remember Me always, He pleads indeed; but remember, above all things, that I am with you all days; abide in My love. The Eucharistic Christ is a living, loving reality in our midst. The unique, redemptive sacrifice of Calvary, renewed each day in His Body, which is the Church, brings literally alive, and keeps alive, the charity of Christ for the food of our souls in a wondrously Blessed Sacrament. Really present on our altars, in our tabernacles, present in the hearts and homes of all who are one with Him by grace divine, He offers us personally His love, and pleads for ours. By this shall all men know that you are faithful to Him, that you belong to Him: not only that you remember and celebrate His saving word and work, but that you put Him on, that you live His very life of love, that you love one another in Him, as He continues to love us all.

The impact on human history of this sacrificial, all-embracing love of the Eucharistic King, alive in the hearts of His holy priests and lay apostles, has been, as our beloved Australia knows so well, tremendous. And who shall set bounds to the conquest of that loving Heart for tomorrow?

If only your resolution is strong, if only your hearts fail Him not by disdaining the all-powerful aid of His grace, the charity of Christ will continue, through you and your children, its blessed mission of unity and peace (*Canon of the Mass*, first Prayer before Communion), unto the final rescue of the world from the powers of darkness that threaten its ruin. It will fortify the precious bonds of your family life, and keep the Christian home the sanctuary of prayer, labour and love that God intended it to be. It will transform your industrial relations, your economic and political planning, by setting at their heart the needs and sacred prerogatives of the human person. It will supply exactly

the warmth and power you need for the task of international forbearance, sympathy and conciliation, traced for you of late by your devoted Hierarchy.

O Sacrament most holy, o Sacrament divine,

All praise and all thanksgiving be every moment thine!

For all that our Lord's Eucharistic charity has meant for you, for all you are resolved to make it mean for the Commonwealth of Australia and a better world to-morrow, may He be eternally adored and thanked and loved.

To quicken those treasured memories and deepen that sturdy resolve, We impart to you now, Venerable Brothers and dearly beloved children, as to all your dear ones near and far, fondly from Our heart the Apostolic Blessing.

* * * *

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE.

(A.A.S., Vol. XXXXV, p. 100).

By a decree of the Holy Office, dated February 13, 1953, Father Leonard Feeney, of the St. Benedict Center, Boston, is declared excommunicated.

The same Sacred Congregation by decree of January 7, 1953 (approved by the Holy Father, March 14, and published March 16) condemned and placed on the Index of prohibited books, the work entitled: "Les événements de la foi 1940-1942" (Jeunesse de l'Eglise), Editions du Seuil, Paris. (A.A.S., Vol. XXXXV, p. 185).

* * * *

PONTIFICAL COMMISSION FOR THE REDACTION OF THE CODE OF ORIENTAL CANON LAW.

(A.A.S., Vol. XXXXV, p. 104).

This Commission under date 8 January, 1953, gave three responses to queries. The first only applies to Australia.

1. Whether a priest of Latin rite, lawfully assisting at a marriage between a Catholic party of Oriental rite and a non-Catholic party, baptized or unbaptized, must keep the regulation of canon 1102 § 2 of the Code of Canon Law or the regulation of canon 85 of the Apostolic Letters, "Crebrae allatae sunt, 22 Feb., 1949).

Answer: *Yes* to the first part; *No* to the second.

2. Whether a priest of Oriental rite assisting at a marriage between a Catholic party of Latin rite and a non-Catholic party, baptized or unbaptized, must keep the regulation of canon 1102 § 2 of the Code of Canon Law or the regulation of canon 85 of the Apostolic Letters, "*Crebrae allatae sunt*".

Answer: *No* to the first part; *Yes* to the second.

W. LEONARD.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE.

THE HOLY TRINITY BOOK OF PRAYERS, by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John K. Ryan, Ph.D. New York, 1952, 303 pp. P. J. Kenedy and Sons.

Msgr. Ryan has composed a very beautiful prayer book, drawing upon the Sacred Scripture, the liturgies, the writings of the saints, and other sources. The editor, who is a professor at the Catholic University of America, states in a foreword: "This collection of prayers has been made for a special purpose. It is to gather into a single volume certain prayers that are commonly used each day... by priests, religious, and devout lay people, together with other prayers that are adapted to particular times and needs". The morning and evening prayers given are those traditional in English speaking seminaries, but Sunday's Prime and Compline, both in Latin and English, are included for lovers of the liturgical prayer. The liturgical prayers before and after Mass are likewise printed in Latin and English, together with numerous prayers drawn from the saints and the Eastern Liturgies, also. Msgr. Ryan is a lucky man to have his name on this splendid little book of Catholic piety. Priests and religious owe it to themselves when requiring a prayer book to examine this well printed, dignified book, which one can feel sure they will treasure very much.

T.V.

Byzantium — Constantinople

Istanbul

Summary: 1453 a turning point in Christian history: The founding of Byzantium: Its history to 330. A.D.: The religious history after 330: the patriarchate of "New Rome". Causes of misunderstanding between East and West—language, theological outlook, liturgy: Schisms and the final Schism: The sack of the city by the Crusaders: The military history of the city: Persistent pressure from Eastern pagans: The advent of the Moslems: Why the city fell: Western attitude before and after the fall of the city: Parallel with the Western attitude to the rise of Communism: Subsequent religious history of the city: Continued pressure from the East on the Christian West: The Moslem danger.

"The ebb and flow in the great human ocean, the surge of our race Eastward and the return of the current back Westward after generations and centuries is a movement of which we moderns are little aware, but it determines history. We are perhaps to-day at this very moment, the mid-twentieth century, about to see another change; either the resurrection of Islam, the reaffirmation of its power, and a further assault from the East against the West or what is less likely (because we Europeans have lost our unity) a return of the West Eastward and a European stamp set again upon the whole of the Mediterranean and its shores, even to Mesopotamia". (Belloc, *Places*, p. 252).

"The past explains the present and the historical process...has its bearing upon our understanding of contemporary life...Dangerous as the practice is it helps to our understanding of history to seize upon dates and events as turning points". (Neale, *The Elizabethan House of Commons*, p. 16).

On Tuesday, May 29th, 1453, the Turks captured Constantinople. On that morning the Christian liturgy was celebrated in the Church of Holy Wisdom. Three days later the Church was again opened for worship, and the Friday prayers of the Moslem were heard where for over a thousand years the Body of Christ had been laid on the altar. Now five hundred years since Mahomet II stood at the altar and offered his thanksgiving prayer the Church of Sancta Sophia has been turned into a museum for the tourist to visit, a showpiece for the student of architecture and a wailing wall for them that believe in God. It is a commonplace with historians that the fall of Constantinople closes an era and opens the door on a new time. Writers as contrasted as Gibbon and Pastor reflect this traditional view. Even the concatenation of sneers which is Gibbon's account of the final siege is interrupted to express the sense of finality felt at the doom of the Eastern capital. "Thus", he writes, "after a siege of fifty-three days, Constantinople,

which had defied the power of the Chosroes, the Chagan and the Caliphs, was irretrievably subdued by the arms of Mahomet the Second. Her empire only had been subverted by the Latins; her religion was trampled in the dust by the Moslem conquerors...A melancholy reflection on the vicissitudes of human greatness forced itself on (Mahomet's) mind; and he repeated an elegant distich of Persian poetry: 'The spider has wove his web in the imperial palace; and the owl hath sung her watch-song on the towers of Afrasiab'." Pastor tells us: 'It would be difficult to describe the terror of Western Christendom on learning that the centre of the old world and the bulwark which protected European civilisation from Asiatic barbarism had fallen into the hands of the infidels. Men felt the event to be a turning point in the history of the world...the ruin of all that the first great medieval period had accomplished was begun...The magnitude and danger of the Eastern question dates from this event'".

But the story of man knows only one really final thing: "Afterwards the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father". (I Cor. 15, 24). It may not be true that "The paths of men are widened with the process of the suns", but on the other hand there are no dead-ends. Always there is continuity, sequence not only in time but in the relation of events. Even Gibbon, materialist though he is in his view of history, when he comes to write off the Eastern capital and empire, is struck with the permanence that a materialist has to admit as a quality of Constantinople. The city "had been left naked and desolate, without a prince or people. But she could not be despoiled of the incomparable situation which marks her for the metropolis of a great empire, and the genius of the place will ever triumph over the accidents of time and fortune". Professor Diehl is a truer philosopher when he writes: "The old story, only partially understood and in a measure forgotten, is not, as is too readily thought, dead history...it still contains promises and pledges for the future". (History of the Byzantine Empire, pp. 175-6). This judgment seems to contain some awareness of the Catholic view of history. We know by reason and by faith that an increasing divine purpose underlies all the movement and change which it is the province of historical narrative to describe, of the philosophic historian to analyse, of the theological student to read in terms of revelation. The ultimate purpose of human story is the glory of God in Christ. How that purpose is being worked out we can see only in a glass darkly. Five hundred years after its fall Byzantium

lets us see something of the forces that work unceasingly through all the variety of change: in our time the story is particularly rich for Catholics in those lessons without which the study of history would do no more than satisfy curiosity.

The people of Megara and Argos, so the story goes, founded Chalcedon in 674 B.C., on the Asiatic coast of the Bosphorus. No wonder that the Delphic oracle ordered a second city to be founded on the other side of the straits to replace the city of "the blind", blind because it seems incredible that the earlier colonists did not see the superiority of the site on the European shore. Chalcedon was to become a mere suburb of a city that grew on another continent. The new city, Byzantium, established by its eponymous founder, Byzas, grew and flourished for a century and a half. Then, ominous of what was to be, the forces of Darius coming up from Ionia threatened the city, and its inhabitants fled, leaving it to be destroyed. Such was its first experience of its destiny as a prize of Oriental invaders. Of course the city rose again. It could not be anything but a great city. Watching over the narrow strait that separates Europe from Asia and the Black Sea from the Sea of Marmora it resembles in position but excels in importance the fortress of Gibraltar in the West. New methods of transport may one day bring it about that the ocean will be as lonely as when little ships crept from headland to headland for pleasure or adventure. But as long as men use the ways of the sea for commerce or for war, as long as the Mediterranean peoples survive, two sites will dominate history, Gibraltar, which guards the passage from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, Byzantium, which watches the entrance to the inner sea. But Byzantium has far more commercial importance than Gibraltar. The Iberian peninsula has outlets to the sea other than Gibraltar. But behind Byzantium is a great hinterland of grainbearing country which has no way of export except through the city or through the straits on which it stands. Moreover it is rich in its own right. Its harbour is one of the great natural harbours of the world. Running in from the Bosphorus, tideless, deep at the very waterfront, it was called the Golden Horn, probably from the wealth of the fisheries which enriched the city. Moreover, it was easily guarded. Occupying a triangular promontory with water on two sides it was built on two hills which a wall at the base easily protected. Even when it spread back from the sea the hilly character of the country continued and the seven hills of the modern Istanbul (*eis ten polin*) were as easy to defend as the two hills of the original promontory.

It is not to our purpose to treat of the first thousand years of the history of Byzantium. It was always a prey to disunity and disturbance. The story of internal strife must have begun when two such enemies as Athens and Sparta were forced to make a joint foundation to guard against the common danger from the East. Through the centuries, right down to the riots when opposing colours were engaged in combined sporting and political rivalry, right down to the religious riots which continued even when the Moslem was at the gates, the city had a sad story of party division and family hatred. Its external history was much like that of other Greek cities. It entered into alliances, supported one side or the other in wars and revolutions, suffered its economic depressions. A couple of generations ago every schoolboy could have told how the Ten Thousand threatened to sack the city and how Xenophon persuaded his peripatetic democrats to stay their hands. Between the time of the Ten Thousand and the rise of Macedonia there was a great change in the strength of the defences. Xenophon tells how his men, finding themselves put out of the city, merely knocked on the gate, insisting that the bar across it be drawn back. When Philip of Macedon, half a century later, tried to enter, three years of siege failed to reduce the city and he had to admit defeat. In the Roman civil wars Severus in 196 A.D. was foolish enough to destroy the city and wise enough to rebuild it immediately to guard against barbarian invasions. It was under Constantine that the importance of the city in world affairs was officially recognised. Diocletian had inaugurated the policy of having a seat of government in the East: Constantine finally fixed that seat at Byzantium which soon came to be called after its second eponymous founder. The avowed purpose of the foundation was to have a suitable base in the East from which to resist the pressure of Persian invaders, just as the transfer of authority in the West from Rome to Ravenna was made in order to have a military base against the pressure of barbarians from the North. The selection of Constantinople as the Eastern and principal capital decided its role in history for the next 1100 years. It was to be the barrier between Europe and Asia. We find it difficult to think of the Roman Empire with its capital not in Rome but on the edge of the Black Sea. But Constantine was a realist. He had no sentimental feeling for Rome. A Serb by birth he spent his early manhood in campaigning on the Northern frontiers and was at York when the army named him Emperor. Nor was it till six years later that he entered Rome. Then his stay lasted only a few weeks.

As an adherent to the Christian faith and as a soldier he found no attraction in Rome. The old nobility and the senatorial families clung to the pagan gods, not in a spirit of religion but because the old tradition of Rome was enshrined in the names of the gods. As a soldier entrusted with the safety of the Eastern frontier Constantine's duty was to base himself at the strongest point from which he could meet the threat along the Southern Danube and on the Asiatic borders of the Empire. Just as at a later date Honorius abandoned Rome for Ravenna so as to face the barbarians from the North so now Constantine, after much consideration, transferred the imperial seat to Byzantium. May of the year 330 saw the new capital—New Rome—as it was designated—fixed as the centre of civil and military government.

With its new civil status Byzantium began to take to itself new ecclesiastical dignity. Hitherto it had been an unimportant suffragan of Thracian Heraclea, which, in turn, was subject to the Patriarch of Antioch. But as we Australians have seen the rise of Canberra to be the seat of an Archbishopric, so the artificially made capital of the Empire reached the highest standing it could ambition. Fifty years after its selection as capital when the Second Ecumenical Council met in Constantinople the third Canon read: "The Bishop of Constantinople shall have the primacy of honour after the Bishop of Rome, because the city is New Rome". But Pope Damasus I explicitly refused to confirm the Canon. Needless to say, the old patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch, though jealous of one another, united to resist the pretensions of the upstart See. A succession of Popes, Boniface I, St. Leo the Great, Gregory the Great set themselves against any change of the ancient order. However the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, under Innocent III, in the chapter on the 'Dignity of Patriarchs', recognised that the Patriarch of Constantinople ranks next to the Roman Pontiff. But we must notice that the Patriarch at the time was a Latin, one of those who held the See during the unhappy years 1204-1261, when the Latin Church had forcibly established itself in Constantinople and ousted the Byzantine rite. There is indeed still a Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, but the title is merely honorary—if that is a word that can be applied to a relic of the tragic blunder of 1204. When the Greek patriarch was present at the Council of Florence in 1439 there was good diplomatic reason for giving him second rank in the Council, for it was engaged in a task of appeasement, working out a formula to unite the separated churches.

The rapid growth of the dignity and power of the Byzantine Patriarch must be set down to the imperial connection. As a result of the influence of the civil power the Oriental section of the Church after the fourth century became less closely linked to Rome. The Emperors considered themselves bound to exercise a certain supervision over the affairs of the local Church, which, owing its greatness to the imperial choice, paid great deference to the Emperor. The special position accorded to the Emperor accounts for the important part he played in the summoning and functioning of the Ecumenical Councils. Eight Eastern Ecumenical Councils met in the East before the Lateran Council of 1123. That was the first General Council to meet in the West, and at a time when the Eastern Church had gone into schism. The close relation of Emperors and Patriarchs did not cause any error about Roman supremacy. But the Pope was rarely asked to intervene in Oriental matters. When his decision was asked for it was generally to settle some acrimonious dispute, and his judgment left a heritage of dissatisfaction in the party against which he decided. Contrast the position in the West. There the Patriarch was also the Pope, and the Western Churches approached the Pope without a prior reference to a separate patriarch. Indeed they hardly thought of the Pope as Patriarch any more than they do to-day.

A further source of difficulty in the relations of Eastern and Western Churches was the difference of language. Only for a short time was the fiction kept up that the empire at Byzantium was Latin and Roman. In practice it was a Greek empire and Rome could not communicate with the Eastern Churches in their own language. The Roman envoys at the imperial court were ignorant of Greek: in turn, when Antioch received a Latin document from the Pope it had to be sent to Constantinople for translation. Furthermore, there developed in East and West a different approach to questions of theology. Philosophy was not a Roman interest and gave no trouble to Western faith. But the chief of the early heresies arose in the East from the conflict of revelation with Oriental philosophy. It is mainly on this account that, as we have noticed, the early Councils were Eastern Councils at which, except for the papal representatives, hardly a Western bishop was present. Eastern theologians were nearly always concerned with questions of dogma rather than of discipline and to this day they do not make a clear-cut distinction between the two, nor has it been found easy to draw up a code of law for the East such as has been familiar to the West for cen-

turies. In the West the Church, greatly influenced by the genius of St. Augustine, grew into a Church with a juridical rather than a mystical character. From St. Augustine's time Western theology tended inevitably towards scholasticism, a system that to this day finds little sympathy in the East. It is well to remember this when we come to the unhappy bickerings of East and West. When in one and the same paragraph schismatic Easterns accuse the West of teaching that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son and of eating cheese on Shrove Tuesday we find Western writers calling them childish, exasperating, insincere. But the Easterns are quite serious. They do not divide the Christian life into 'matters of faith' and 'matters of discipline'. They mingle the two elements, just as they embrace the doctrine that the Church is the Mystical Body in a way that is expressed in their liturgies far more clearly than in the public worship of the West.

The difference of liturgy was another source of friction between East and West. Nowadays we are educated to think of the liturgies as a rich heritage of history and belief. In an earlier time, combined with a laudable attachment to one's own rite, went a jealousy of other rites that were no less Catholic in origin and growth. The Genoese and Venetians who held to the Latin rite in Constantinople, the Greeks who followed the Byzantine rite in many parts of Southern Italy and the adjoining islands, had official approval, but there was a feeling that they were only tolerated, that they were alien not only in race but also in religion. In one case the disagreement about rites was mixed up with political considerations. The question of the correct rite to be used among the pagans settled in Bulgaria and turned Christian was involved with the question whether they belonged to the Eastern or Western patriarchate, whether they were part of the Greek Empire or of the new Empire of the West. Charlemagne had been accepted by the Pope as heir to part at least of the ruined empire which had been shattered by the irruption of the barbarians from the North. This sensible action of the Pope vexed the pride of the Byzantines and made them quick to find a grievance. The confused quarrel over the Bulgars played no small part in the dispute formerly known as the Schism of Photius. Even if we accept the modern view that there was no such schism the effect of the misunderstandings, charges and countercharges was to leave a feeling of bitterness and to create a strong anti-papal party in Constantinople. By this time there was no reality behind the pretence that Constantinople was capital of half the Roman Empire. The Western

half of the Empire had disintegrated into the various fragments out of which grew the states of modern Europe. The Eastern Empire had become the Greek Empire with its own code of laws, its own architecture and its own language. Commerce and a grudging unity of religion were all that held East and West in some sort of harmony. But the religious tie was not to endure. No one can say exactly why the great break occurred. In the fatal year, 1054, there was no dispute, religious or other, between Rome and Constantinople. Michael Caerularius, a man of overweening ambition, saw a chance of getting all power, civil and sacred, into his hands: so he deliberately started and kept alive a quarrel with Rome. Probably no one foresaw the outcome. The Emperor, a weak man indeed and under the control of Michael, was most friendly to the Holy See. Alexandria was in peace with Rome and Antioch in friendship. But these two ancient Sees had been irreparably weakened in influence by the surge of Arab invasion. So there was little resistance to Michael, who was determined to quarrel even if the other party was not disposed to fight. Possibly the delegates sent by the Pope to settle the dispute were too dramatic. With patience the trouble might have died down and an uneasy peace have been restored. But when the envoys entered the great Basilica of Sancta Sophia and walking through a dense congregation laid on the altar a sentence of excommunication against Michael they played right into his hands. Their action was directed against one man only: nor has Rome ever taken formal action against any other member of the Eastern churches, far less cut the Eastern Churches off by juridical act. But from July 16th, 1054, when the Roman envoys walked out of the Basilica, except for brief periods, there has been schism between East and West. Perhaps the envoys saw no further ahead than did Luther when he, according to custom, nailed up his theses for a scholastic disputation. But the results of their action were to reach further than his. Separated as we are geographically from the dissident Churches we do not realise the schism as we realise the break between ourselves and the Protestants amongst whom we live. But the schism of the East not only cut off wide territories: it not only made more difficult the approach to the Churches that went into heresy many centuries before: it put up geographical barriers to missionary effort and presented to the pagan world the spectacle of Christianity divided against itself. Of course, the Holy See repeatedly made efforts towards reunion. But she met with no success except when the East would agree to unite in the hope of getting

military aid from the West. These temporary reunions have always been met in the East by sullen intransigence or by outbreaks of hatred and opposition amongst the populace. The opposition arises from causes deeper than intellectual disagreement and its origin has to be sought in irrational emotions.

This emotion of hatred of the West springs mainly from the bitterness left by the Crusades. It might be thought that the recovery of the Holy Land from Islam was a cause which would unite East and West. It completed the disunion. The easy route to the Holy Land lay by Constantinople. The emperors could not but be suspicious of huge armies from the West passing by their walls. The crusading spirit was not Oriental: all the powers at Constantinople hoped for was, that if they gave some co-operation, the West would win back for them some of their territories which the Arabs had overrun. They were not willing to have a Norman kingdom replacing the Moslem power. The setting up of the Norman kingdom in the Holy Land so alarmed Constantinople that, at the opening of the Third Crusade, the Emperor Isaac entered into negotiations with Saladin to unite against the invaders from the West, while in the West there was a proposal to begin a crusade against the schismatic Greeks. But it was the Fourth Crusade that made enduring the breach between East and West. Officially the Crusaders were not to go by the Constantinople route but to attack Egypt and make it the base for an advance. The army gathered at Venice but was delayed there until the money could be collected to pay the Venetians the cost of transport. But the politicians who now shared the direction of Crusades had already made up their minds to attack Constantinople. Venice, though she had received many favours from Constantinople, was anxious to crush a great commercial rival. In the event the Crusaders were diverted to Constantinople and, after waiting there for eight months without receiving promised help in men and arms, sacked the city. Fire, rapine, destruction showed the hate that lay beneath the crosses which the Latins displayed on their breasts. But worse than the usual accompaniments of the sacking of a city were the outrages perpetrated in the cause of religion. The Greek patriarch was expelled to make way for a Venetian. Bishops of dependent sees were driven into exile. The great churches of the city were taken over by the Latins and the ancient and beloved rite of Byzantium was banished even from Sancta Sophia. The setting up of a Count of Flanders as Emperor, the establishment of Western kingships in Eastern dependen-

cies, the murder of the Greek emperor, these might have been regarded as part of the fortunes of war. That the cunning Venetians should take over the maritime empire of the East and hold 'a half and a quarter' of what had been the domain of Constantinople may have seemed a worthwhile reward of treachery. The rich loot that came to the churches and palaces of Europe may have seemed a good exchange for loss of honour. But when the Pope said that for the future the Greeks would always regard the Latins as curs he did not overstate the sense of horror that was planted in the Eastern mind. Yet even the Pope, though he had resisted the diversion of the Crusade from Egypt, though he expressed horror at the fall of the Eastern capital and excommunicated its captors, accepted the new position and rejoiced at the ending, even by violence, of the Eastern schism. But the Greeks reconquered their city in 1261 and the schism was renewed with a wider cleavage and a deeper bitterness. And if uninformed tourists admire the sculptured treasures of the Venice of our time those who know whence those treasures came as spoil of war see in them a memorial to a deed of shame, a perpetual monument to the ruin brought on the cause of Christ by those who wore His Cross.

The fall of Constantinople was the end of one period of her religious history. It was also the end of a long period of her civil and military story. Indeed her religious and military history are but phases of one struggle. Always she stood in her own esteem and that of the world as the barrier to the military forces from Asia which aimed at the overthrow of Christianity. The history of the thousand years and more during which she was a great capital vindicates the judgment of Constantine. At the very time when he set up his new capital the Persians were pressing on the Eastern frontier and the Goths were on the Danube. But beyond these immediate threats there were already the stirrings of nomadic peoples who, under the names of Huns, Mongols, Tartars, Turks, were to keep Constantinople under strain for a thousand years and to set up a movement, indirectly anti-Christian, of which the end is not yet. The Huns spreading from Central Asia pushed into Europe and came into collision with other nomads who had already descended from the North. Had Attila pushed his threat against the Eastern Empire the world's story would have been very different. But the lure of Lombardy and Rome was too strong. He was content to alarm Constantinople in 441 and again in 447. On each occasion he was bought off and in the interval of six years his power had been so

diminished that he could hardly do more than threaten. Similarly Theodoric with his Ostrogoths was prevailed on by the Eastern Empire to direct his forces against the richer West. Indeed the task of carving up the Western Empire so engrossed the invaders that Constantinople hardly had to face a determined attack. There were alarms and assaults from the North—the exact number is still uncertain—but all came to nothing and the failures made it almost a military dogma that the city could not be captured unless the attackers had command of the sea. Not until the Moslems came did the pagans attempt a united attack by land and sea. The story of the efforts of the Eastern emperors to win back portions of the territories which had been overrun by barbarians, the story of the wavering line of battle which for centuries held back from the Christian world the Eastern hordes that poured up through Asia Minor, is too long to be set out in detail. But danger was never absent. In 502 Persia was the threat. In 532 Justinian gained a respite of ten years by buying off Chosroes. Twice in a decade, in 608 and in 617, the Persian armies made their way to the Bosphorus and from the suburb of Chalcedon looked across to the imperial city. But the narrow sea was as impassable a defence as the Channel was to England when Napoleon stood at Boulogne. Next the Avars appeared before the city and in 626 joined the Persians in an attack. But always the defences held and the tradition, starting in pagan times when the goddess of the crescent moon was thought to have saved the city, took firm hold. The city was 'guarded-of-God'.

Then began the attack which was to continue with no real interruption for 800 years. The Moslems appeared. If Mecca had not cast out Mahomet or if it had left him in peace at Medina all might have been well. But the people of Mecca resented his denunciation of their many gods and used force against him. Mahomet armed his followers and retaliated. Fanaticism put on the vesture of religion. Islam was on the march. It is not our purpose to tell in any detail the story of the events that led up to the final trial of strength with the Eastern Empire. The amazing surge of the armies of the Caliphs beyond the Arabian borders, the conquest of Persia and Egypt in a score of years, the transformation of desert nomads into a sea power, these things lie outside our scope. But as early as 668 the Moslem army was on the Southern shore of the Sea of Marmora. However, they had not yet sufficient seapower to make good a crossing of the water. In 673 they returned with both sea and land forces and for five years Constantinople was a beleaguered

city. At the end of that time the Moslems withdrew to the easier task of completing the conquest of Asia Minor and North Africa. They returned to the Bosphorus in 712. In 717 and 718 the city was attacked fiercely and continuously, but in vain. For the greater part of the eighth century the strong Isaurian dynasty stood firm against Arab pressure and even pushed the pagans back to the Southern frontiers of Asia Minor. In all that century there was no real peace, only occasional breathing spaces. And at the end, Haroun-al-Raschid, the good Caliph of Bagdad, extorted tribute from Constantinople. Even when the Moslems were comparatively inactive the Macedonian dynasty that followed the Isaurian was kept busy repelling the Bulgars and the Russians.

Then came the Seljuk Turks and the slow collapse of the Empire before them. In the years between 1062 and 1079 they wrested from Constantinople parts of the Empire that were never to be regained, Eastern Asia Minor, Armenia, Cappadocia, and last of all, Chrysopolis, one of the seaside suburbs of the capital built on the Asiatic shore. The next blow was the sacking of the city by the Crusaders from which it never recovered. Though the Latins ruled the city only from 1204-1261, when the Emperor returned from the temporary capital at Nicaea it was to an empire which had broken up into a number of independent principalities. He could drive out the Latin patriarch and the Venetian traders who had made their own the best part of the city, but of the empire that once went as far as Persia there remained only the capital itself, a part of Macedonia and Thessalonica, Thrace and a few precariously held Mediterranean islands. Moreover the expulsion of the Latins left Western Christians hostile and the Pope and the Venetians were not disposed to send help to the restored dynasty. So when the Turks again began their attacks on the city—it could do no more than defend itself and by 1422 the rest of the Empire, except the Peloponnesus and Macedonia, was Moslem. By 1448 all was gone except the city itself and Mohammed II made up his mind to end the long struggle by taking the capital.

The first lesson for our time from the siege of Constantinople is the danger of complacency. Certain things, men think, cannot happen. Singapore could not fall. Gibraltar, saved for us only by the unacknowledged firmness of General Franco, could not fall. In our own country, when Darwin was attacked, when the harbour of Broome was attacked, when Sydney and Newcastle had more than one attack from the Japanese, the country was not stirred from its sense of security. How

then can we blame the 15th century Europeans if a city which had withstood a thousand years of pagan assault was looked on as divinely guarded? Surely it was impregnable. And superstition and credulity gave even its citizens a sureness of their invincibility. The fortune-tellers of the time had made known how far the Turks were to advance before God crushed them. Almost to the end the West remained complacent or hostile. Had there been atlases with coloured diagrams or newspapers with sketches they would have shown that, with all its possessions and outer defences in Moslem hands, the sole hope of the city lay in the natural advantages of its position and in the prospect of help from the West. Only Pope Nicholas V seems to have realised at the end that the last bastion against Islam in the East was in danger. He tried to raise a new crusade. But Charles VII was uneasy on the throne of France and in fear of a sudden raid from across the Channel. In England itself the great lords were engaged in exploiting the weakness of Henry VI. The knights, like those who were invited in our Lord's parable, were either indifferent or busy. They could not or they would not come. The Venetians and Genoese might have been expected to come to the rescue of their own citizens who had great trading houses on the Galata side of the Golden Horn. But the maritime cities were not distressed at the danger and possible destruction of their chief trade rival and in any case Venice was having a little private war with the Duchy of Milan. The Pope could perhaps have done more if the scholastics had not taken to writing treatises for or against coming to the help of a schismatic church attacked by pagans. It was vain for the Pope to plead that there was now no schismatic church since the Council of Florence only a few years ago had ended the quarrel. It was plain to all the world that even if a formula of reunion had been found at a Council attended by the Emperor and Patriarch from Constantinople, this union with the Pope of Rome, resting on political motives, had stirred the people of Constantinople to a frenzy of anger. Gibbon sums up the attitude of the West tersely and pretty accurately: "Some states were too weak and others too remote: by some the danger was considered imaginary, by others as inevitable: the Western princes were involved in their endless and domestic quarrels: and the Roman Pontiff was exasperated by the falsehood and obstinacy of the Greeks".

On April 6th, 1453, the final siege began by land and sea. The Turks tried in vain to pass the barrier of chains and guardships that lay across the narrow entrance to the Golden Horn. They were shocked

when a few Christian ships, coming to aid the Greeks, forced a way through the investing fleet. Mahommed was in despair and thought of abandoning the siege. He staked all on one last stratagem. He sent a number of small boats overland on rollers and escaped the vigilance of the city's guards. Thus he took the Greeks, both fleet and army, in the rear. At the very last the Pope was able to gather a mixed fleet to go to the rescue. It was 'too little and too late'. Too late for the city had fallen when it arrived: too little for it seems to have fallen as a prize to the victors. On May 29th Constantine received Communion in Sancta Sophia in unity with the Holy See. Late that day he charged on his horse and fell as the overwhelming numbers of the Turks broke in.

Aeneas Sylvius tells us that when news of the capture of Constantinople reached the West such was men's complacency that they did not believe it. But when the truth was too plain for further doubt we find men's minds working as they do in our own time. Such a revolutionary state of things, they said, could not endure. We recall how when the Bolshevik revolution broke the Czarist power and set up a state of society bewildering to the European mind men thought of it as something that could not last. In both North and South Russia efforts were made to restore the order consecrated by centuries. But we recall also what small enthusiasm the Western peoples showed for armed intervention, how a common policy was made impossible by conflicting private interests, how men became reconciled to the idea that the new state of affairs might have to be endured for three or even five years. Now in the second generation since the murder of the Romanoffs we have come to accept as normal and enduring the thing that shocked the world. So it was when Constantinople fell. The European world agreed that somebody must do something. Letters quoted by Pastor are full of the shocked wonder of Christendom. The Pope busied himself in trying to unite warring rulers and to reconcile the selfish aims of European courts. Crusade was a word heard again amongst Christians. But it was in vain. The age of the crusades was over. The spirit of national division, growing since Rienzi's day, was stronger than the sense of Christian unity. Slowly the Roman Pontiffs realised that the West was complacent, indifferent, concerned only with a selfish struggle for wealth and dominion. Islam was left to itself and Constantinople was accepted as a Moslem capital.

But here comes another point in the parable. Islam was left to itself. The West accepted the *status quo*. But Islam had no intention

of accepting it, refused to be left to itself. There was a time when the powers decided to leave Communist Russia to herself, to let her go her own way, not without a hope that the new system would break down from internal weakness. But the space of thirty years has brought it home to us that Russia does not intend to be content with imposing Communist institutions only on the former Czarist dominions. She is ceaselessly engaged in spreading, by every means short of open war, the doctrines of anti-Christ. So was it when the Turks took Constantinople. Far from resting content with their triumph they began to push forward by land and sea. For nearly a century and a half there was tension in Europe. The Republic of Venice, the old trade rival of the Greek capital, became tributary to its new lords. The Janissaries were under the walls of Vienna. The Turks reached Ratisbon. They were smartly checked at the second battle of Lepanto. But it was not till the masters of Constantinople became effeminate through self-indulgence and their power was weakened by the jealousy of their high officials that the dynamic urge of Islam was worn out for a time and Europe had some breathing space.

Meanwhile the Eastern Church sank into a pitiful condition of Erastianism. Her patriarchs had said that they would prefer the Saracen to Rome. They got their wish. The Turks did not destroy the Greek schismatics. They took over Sancta Sophia and the great churches and turned them into mosques. But they preserved the patriarchate that it might be a centre of enmity against all things Western. The patriarch of 1453 was replaced by one whose main title to the dignity was his hatred of Rome. And from that year till 1922 the once great patriarch of New Rome was little more than a Turkish nominee who bought at a high price the right to be the spiritual ruler of such Christians as were prepared to pay him homage. A state of spiritual lethargy seemed to settle on the Orthodox Churches except in Russia, where, until recent days, the Church was a centre of much holiness and missionary effort. But we must remember that scholars still dispute whether the Russian church was ever officially schismatic. The other Orthodox Churches were certainly schismatic and generally speaking fell into a state of stagnation. Little by little as various parts of the Turkish empire secured their freedom and new national churches were founded the honour of the patriarchate of Constantinople waned, and, outside a narrow area, there remained only a vague tradition of her former greatness. With the coming of Ataturk and the rise of the new

Turkish nationalism a last blow was stuck at the old church. The Basilica of Sancta Sophia which at least held the aroma of the old religion about it was turned into a museum: the theological seminaries were closed: the religious brotherhoods were dissolved: the religious schools were displaced under the new secular system. The Sultan and the Caliphs ceased to exist and in 1923 the capital was transferred to Ankara in the highlands of Asiatic Turkey. The old relation of the Patriarch to the government as a sort of minister of the Crown was abolished. So convinced were the Nationalists that a break must be made with the corrupt past that Islam was as much the object of attack as Christianity. The new state was to be a purely secular state on Western lines and a stroke of the pen was to sever all the ties that Turkey had with her social and religious past. It would be dogmatising to say that such a revolution cannot be effected. It was done in Russia. Can it be done successfully in Turkey? Perhaps not so easily. H. V. Morton tells in one of his travel books of a remark made to him by a Syrian merchant while they were fellow travellers in a train between Aleppo and the Southern Turkish border. "How can you kill Istanbul? Nature has made it the bridge between East and West. It has always been a fortress and a bazaar. How can you kill it?" Signs are not wanting that the city of Constantine cannot be killed. Six years after the government deserted it it was found necessary for some departments to return to it. The foreign representatives had not given up their offices in it. About two years ago it was decided that in the winter months it should again be the seat of government. Now it has been decided that there must be toleration for religious schools and for religious teaching, provided that such teaching is not in the hands of foreigners but of those who have been educated in the New Turkey and indoctrinated with the ideas of Turkish nationalism.

This sketch has been written to draw some parallels and to lead up to a moral. While the Western world is darkened by the fear of Stalingrad history seems to suggest that there is a greater danger to fear. Since the Huns rolled Westward and since, centuries later, Genghis Khan's nomads started a new Westward movement from China, in all the confused story of irruption and repulse one thing is clear. There is an underlying failure to come to any common understanding between East and West. The Christian creed might have broken down the strange antipathy in ways of thought and feeling, but the Christian creed has not yet imposed itself on the world. The East

is hostile to the West even though there may be temporary periods of superficial peace. The Russian himself is more Mongol than European. He is now in Berlin. The Yellow peril was a subject of jest in a generation that lasted to see it translated from jest to earnest. Russia has set to work to use the East for her own purpose. Humanly speaking there is small hope that China will not become a Communist 'sphere of influence'. She seems to be skipping the stages through which our Western civilisation has evolved and to be passing direct from Mongol culture to Communist doctrine. India is no longer under Western tutelage and, with her miserable social conditions and her swarming poor, is perfect soil for the growth of Russian ideas. The old hostility of Persia against the West is reviving and Russia is sympathising with her reviving nationalism. It is obvious that some form of Communist technique is behind the trouble in Egypt. North Africa and the Soudan are restless. Right through the Eastern world Russia has no need to stir up trouble. It is there and she is skilled in using trouble for her own ends. But what Russia needs is to find some common grounds on which these peoples may come together. Except China, which seems already to be a Russian satellite, all these peoples of Oriental mind may be brought together by one principle of unity. That principle is the Moslem creed. It is true that Pakistan, Persia, Egypt, Tunisia differ as nations. True it is also that Islam is divided by sectarian differences. But just as Protestant sects find a basis of unity when bigotry against Catholics is aroused so Islam is, at heart, one in its hatred of Christian creeds. It is beyond question that there is a common stirring of pride in Moslem lands, pride in past achievements in philosophy and abstract science, in poetry and architecture. If Russia can touch to flame the fanaticism that underlies all Mohammedanism then the world would be marked out into two great camps ready for the final battle. If only people looked at atlases and diagrams, available as they were not in 1452, it would be plain that Western Europe is faced with a combination of anti-Christian forces under which she may well go down. And Russia means to effect that combination. A documented study of Russian plans for the East shows that as early as 1922 the capture of the East was made part of the general plan of Communist campaign. Any one who studies the progress that has been made in thirty years towards Pan-Islam will realise that Russia is not far from her goal. It would not be unworthy of Communist cynicism for atheism to call to its aid the fierce religious fanaticism of the Moslem peoples. Belloc, in a quotation set

at the head of this article, foresees that Islam may move West again. Such a movement is suggested by the continuity of history. What was possible when Belloc wrote has in the space of a few years become probable. There is a real danger that a Communist Pan-Islam may march again and win a greater victory over Old Rome than when five hundred years ago she triumphed and New Rome went down.

The peoples of the West are being trained to think in terms of armaments and atomic weapons. But there are forces greater than those developed in laboratories. In the days of Mohammed II, as in our own, there were found Christian scientists who sold their scientific secrets to the foes of Christianity. But no one thinks that the greater strength of the Moslem artillery was the real explanation of the fall of Constantinople. The fall was due to disunion, indifference, complacency, selfishness. What then of to-day? The Pope, like Nicholas V, five hundred years ago, is tirelessly urging the nations to face the peril at the gates, to put on the armour of faith, to begin by moral regeneration. But Pius XII, like Nicholas V, is crying unheeded in the wilderness. Disunity, indifference, complacency, selfish rivalry, these dominate the West as they did in 1453. On the other side stand a ruthless anti-God Communism and a Moslem world that may at any moment burst into a flame of fanaticism. All we can say is that there remain a promise and a question: the promise—'The gates of hell shall not prevail ... I am with you all days ... This is your victory, your faith': the question—'Think you when the Son of Man cometh He shall find faith upon the earth?'.

WILLIAM KEANE, S.J.

Bishop Willson, XVI.

SISTERS OF CHARITY.

Summary: Dr. Willson invites Sisters of Charity to send sisters from Sydney to Hobart in 1844—In 1846 he appeals to Mother Aikenhead; he finds Sisters established in Tasmania on his return—Foundation in Hobart due to dissatisfaction of the sisters with the rulings of Abbot Gregory in Sydney—June 20, 1847, three sisters arrive in Hobart—They establish a diocesan congregation, which was sanctioned by Rome—Charges against Gregory's administration and his defence—Dr. Willson praises the work of the sisters in Tasmania—Their work among the female prisoners and in the schools—Careers of foundation sisters—Healing of division among the Sisters of Charity under Mother Francis McGuigan.

In the preface to "*The Australian Daughters of Mary Aikenhead*", published in 1938, Archbishop Simonds wrote: "It will always be the enviable distinction of the daughters of Mary Aikenhead that they were selected by Divine Providence to carry to our shores the religious habit of the Church's consecrated virgins. This important landmark in the religious progress of Australia occurred just one hundred years ago; and there are few centenary events in our history that are more worthy of our grateful commemoration. When the five courageous Sisters of Charity stepped ashore at Sydney, on the last day of the year 1838, they could hardly have visualised the glorious future which awaited the religious habit in that gloomy vale of tears into which they had descended. But great movements of divine grace usually have their sources in the humblest of beginnings; and to-day the outstanding glory of the Catholic Church in Australia is that army of ten thousand religious women, clothed in the habits of their various Religious Institutes, whose unselfish lives cover the whole field of educational and charitable service of the flock of Christ".

On the occasion of his first visit to New South Wales, in 1844, the Bishop of Hobart discussed with these pioneer Sisters of Charity the prospects of securing a community for his newly-created diocese. Anxious to have a convent, and confident that the Sisters would co-operate, he there and then drew up a plan for a nuns' residence to be erected on the land formerly occupied by the Rev. Philip Conolly. The Sisters, already increased in numbers by the admission of some postulants, were most willing to make a second foundation in Australia. So promising did the outlook seem that the Bishop, at Easter, 1845, addressed his people in these words:

"Amidst the various wants of our extensive missions, one of the most soul stirring is that which presents itself in the number of the female sex who are in bondage. Whatever may have been the cause of the loss of liberty in this unfor-

fortunate class of our fellow-creatures, and of their removal from our fatherland, they are still, or should be, the objects of the deepest compassion. 'God had compassion on them that were in bonds' (Heb. 10, 34). To forsake them would be to us, the pastor of their souls, to seal our own condemnation. Christ, describing the last judgment says, 'Depart from me, you cursed into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels . . .' 'I was in prison and you did not minister to me . . . As long as you did it not to one of these least ones, neither did you it to me'. (Matt. XXV, 41-45.)

"Beloved in our Lord, when we, as the pastor of souls, peruse the appalling sentence in the Gospel of truth, and reflect upon the awful responsibility with which we are charged in having to 'minister to those who are in prison', we daily lament our incapacity to render that aid which so many who have fallen into error demand of us, and tremble lest we may not watch over these 'least ones', whom, even in their state of degradation, Christ likens to himself; and pray the God of all mercy, to place such help at our disposal as shall enable us to instruct those who are ignorant of the doctrines of eternal life—to awaken to feelings of sorrow and repentance those who remain hardened in heart and callous of past iniquity, to encourage the weak and timid to have confidence in the mercies of God—to warn the bold and unwary of the dangers they will have to encounter—and to prepare the hundreds who are the objects of our solicitude, to use the liberty that will be granted to them, as rational beings, and as Christians who hope to gain the Kingdom of Heaven. This must be, of course, the work of divine grace, through the merits of Jesus Christ Our Lord; but it is our burden duty to co-operate by untiring efforts and labours to restore the fallen, or the malediction just referred to will be our lot.

"Beloved in the Lord, with joy we announce that with your co-operation, we have an opportunity of establishing in this Colony a house of *Sisters of Charity*. This institution, by the divine aid, is calculated to produce benefits most solid, and blessings most fruitful, not only to the bond, but also to the free—to the orphan, the widow, the sick, and afflicted, and also to shed around it the sweet odour of unaffected piety and pure benevolence. This is clean religion and undefiled before God and the Father; to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world' (James, 1, 27).

"We feel confident that this intelligence will be received by you with heartfelt satisfaction. The admirable lives of the *Sisters of Charity* have rendered them objects of such universal respect and veneration throughout the whole of Europe, may it be truly said, wherever the name of Christ has brought salvation to mankind, that it would be useless to offer encomiums on them here. And the respect and veneration are not only given by Catholics, but also by all Christians, however widely they may differ on some doctrinal points, with the Religion that fosters this admirable institution. . . .

"We humbly trust the influence of a well-regulated community of *Sisters of Charity* will prove a source of inestimable blessings to the rising generation in this Colony; that the Orphans at the Queen's School—those little ones who ask for bread—and the children of the poor, will have their young minds trained to virtue by the example and tender solicitude of the Religious".

Though willing to extend their mission of mercy to Hobart the Sisters could not at that early period make a division of their forces. But the Bishop persevered in hope and in prayer. Then he saw one way to hasten the solution of his problem. Why not do as Dr. Ullathorne had done for Sydney—go to Dublin to approach Mother Aikenhead in person? It appeared to be the only course. Before leaving Hobart for Europe in September, 1846, Dr. Willson made his reso-

lution known to the Catholic people. But Providence had other designs. What must have been his surprise and satisfaction on reaching the end of his journey to learn that the Sisters of Charity had already established themselves in his diocese?

How are we to account for this unexpected and happy development? At this period, Archbishop Polding also had sailed overseas, leaving Sydney in charge of his Vicar-General, the Rev. H. G. Gregory, Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery. For the Sisters of Charity, as for others who did not follow the rule of Saint Benedict, there ensued a season of uneasiness and hardship. The Christian Brothers, dissatisfied with conditions, offered to transfer themselves to Hobart but changed their plans and went back to Ireland. One of the Sisters, Magdalen Cator, unable to endure Colonial life, also returned to her homeland. The other four pioneers—Sisters de Sales O'Brien, John Cahill, Baptist de Lacy, and Xavier Williams—considered themselves justified in resisting attempts to alter their rules and constitutions, as also interference with the internal discipline of their novitiate house at Parramatta. To such a degree did friction grow that two of the Sisters—John Cahill and de Sales O'Brien—received a peremptory command to leave New South Wales in a ship supposed to be setting off for New Zealand. Sister Xavier Williams, who had left Ireland as a novice, now rather bewildered to find herself nominated Superior, told Abbot Gregory that her outcast companions desired to await the Archbishop's return. No plea, however, could move him to withdraw the edict:

"With reference to your letter of yesterday's date [22nd April, 1847], in which you state that Mrs. O'Brien [Sister de Sales] has no reason for thinking it to be the will of God that she should leave Parramatta at present, and that she wishes to adhere to what I recommended her, that is, to fulfil here her duties as a Sister of Charity until Dr. Polding's return, and that Mary John [Cahill] desires the same, I beg most emphatically to state for the information of these ladies that it does not rest with them how long they shall remain in New South Wales.

"I certainly did recommend Mrs. O'Brien some time ago to remain in the quiet performance of her duties as Sister of Charity till the Archbishop's return; but in referring to this recommendation she should have borne in mind that it was before she had proved herself incompetent to fulfil the charge committed to her. . . . Read this to the community and say that a more explicit answer concerning New Zealand is required".¹

This crisis arose after Sister de Sales O'Brien had begun her second term of office as Superior, having been re-elected and approved by the Archbishop prior to his embarkation for England. What did the future hold for the two distressed Sisters? They had not long to wait

¹Letters in *Willson Papers*.

for an answer. In closing one door Divine Providence opened another. Recalling the invitation formerly issued by Bishop Willson they wrote to the Rev. William Hall, Vicar-General of Hobart, offering to place themselves under his care. Not for a moment did he hesitate to accept the gift within his reach. "Frequently and deeply" he replied, "have I regretted the want of such services as yours amongst us; and you may be assured that I do, with heartfelt pleasure, accept your offer. Our good Bishop intends visiting your house in Ireland in order to obtain assistance; but I will write to him immediately and inform him what I have done; and I hope your letter to the Superior will arrive in time. Let me know by the very first opportunity when you can come—what you wish me to do. We intend to build a convent on our own ground; but when you are on the spot you can suggest. Money is much wanting, but that difficulty will be overcome. Once more, dear Rev. Madam, do not delay. I will suspend all my plans until I hear from you.

"I have lost the Christian Brothers. They have left Sydney: but I hope the Bishop will bring some out with him. Present my respects to Mrs. Cahill [Sister John]. I shall daily pray for your translation to Hobart Town—it is the will of God".

Two months after this—20th June, 1847—the barque *Louisa* anchored in the harbour of Hobart. On board were not two, but three, Sisters of Charity. Unwilling to be separated from her exiled companions Sister Xavier Williams—the first lady to pronounce the Vows of Religion in Australia—had insisted on coming with them. The nuns went straight to Saint Joseph's Church to express their gratitude to God for His mercies and favours. Then, amidst general rejoicing, they were taken to a temporary abode nearby, where they lodged, awaiting the completion of the residence, begun by Father Therry, and originally designed to serve as a presbytery. On July 2nd, feast of Our Lady's Visitation, the three valiant women entered into possession of their house. Considerably enlarged in the course of time by necessary extensions this convent still remains the home of the Sisters of Charity in Hobart.

Cut off from both Dublin and Sydney the Sisters now became a diocesan Congregation with the Bishop of Hobart as their ecclesiastical Superior.

In answer to a Petition forwarded by the Sisters the Holy See sanctioned this withdrawal from central authority. Events had hastened a recourse to Rome. When Bishop Davis, O.S.B., came to Hobart

with proposals for a settlement of the Therry-Willson disagreement he presented to Sisters John Cahill and de Sales O'Brien for their signatures a legal instrument by which certain property at Parramatta held in trust for their Congregation would be conveyed to Archbishop Polding and Abbot Gregory. The two Sisters refused to sign: a decision commended by Dr. Willson. In 1851 Dr. Polding made another move with the same object, adding that "further measures" would be invoked should his wishes be any longer disregarded. Then with the Bishop's help the Sisters drew up a petition to the Holy See declaring² :—

- 1) "In 1838 five Sisters of Charity went from Dublin to Sydney.
- 2) "Mrs. O'Brien was appointed Superioress, and confirmed as such by Dr. Polding.
- 3) "In 1842 the Archbishop, without the knowledge or consent of the community, petitioned the Holy Father to constitute himself Ecclesiastical Superior in place of the Archbishop of Dublin.
- 4) On his return to Sydney, in 1843, Dr. Polding did not mention that the Sisters had been cut off from their Mother House.
- 5) "In 1846, immediately before departing again for Europe, the Archbishop confirmed the re-appointment of Mrs. O'Brien as Superioress for *the six following years*.
- 6) "Immediately after His Grace's departure, Dr. Gregory, for the first time, announced to the community that the Archbishop of Sydney was their Superior, and he asked them to give their consent to this arrangement.
- 7) "In submission to the Holy Father; and as the Archbishop's petition was granted on condition of their being permitted to follow the rules of their Institute *as carried out in Dublin*; and as it was declared that the property given to them was to be *held in perpetuity*, the Sisters complied with Dr. Gregory's wishes.
- 8) "Dr. Gregory assumed an office detrimental to the proper discipline of the convent; and, on account of the expostulation of the Superioress, he deposed her and appointed Mrs. Williams in her place.
- 9) "Dr. Gregory insisted that Sister de Sales O'Brien, and an aged Sister, Mrs. Cahill, who supported the Superioress, should not only leave the convent, but also the Colony.
- 10) "Dr. Gregory would not listen to the prayers of the deposed Superioress and of the other Sisters to be allowed to remain in the convent until the Archbishop's return.
- 11) "New Zealand is not less than 1200 miles from Sydney; had no convent of any Order at that time; and Bishop Pompallier was not in the country.
- 12) "Hobart Town is 700 miles distant from New South Wales: had no convent and no other support could be offered the Sisters than a house to shelter them.
- 13) "Through some small means of their own, procured from Ireland, and through aid received by conducting a school for the poor, the Sisters have subsisted since their expulsion from their convent in New South Wales.
- 14) "No claim is made on the property of the Sisters of Charity in New South Wales, nor have the Hobart Sisters any desire to continue as its legal trustees.
- 15) "The Archbishop of Sydney, in his letter of 14th February, 1851, insists upon the property *given in perpetuity* to the Sisters being legally assigned to him-

²Document among *Willson Papers*.

self and Dr. Gregory, their heirs and assigns, *not to be held in trust*; in addition he threatens to visit with censures the two Sisters if they refuse to comply with his wishes".

Having specified the property in question with the story of its acquisition—chiefly through the generosity of William Davis—the petitioners begged the Holy See to direct them how to act "for the safeguarding of religion and justice". They next prayed for the canonical institution of their Institute in Van Diemen's Land:—

"We humbly petition Our Most Holy Father and Sovereign Pontiff to grant a Rescript to empower the Superioress of the Sisters of Charity (and her successor in office), now residing in Hobart Town, Van Diemen's Land, to receive novices to be trained in religious life, and to be professed according to the Constitutions (confirmed by His Holiness Pope Gregory XVI, 19th June, 1836), and also to receive the dowers, legacies, and other property, for the support of the members of the said Pious Congregation—with a penalty of excommunication incurred by any person who should alienate, or transfer, such property or any such property, to any other purpose whatever".

Incidents connected with the return to Ireland of Sister M. Baptist de Lacy—the last of the original community to leave New South Wales—revived a spirit of discontent and criticism in Catholic circles. The clergy and the public placed most of the blame on Dr. Gregory's administration. On the other hand the *Freeman's Journal*—a paper circulating amongst the Catholics of all the Australian Colonies and often in England and Ireland—hinted that Dr. Willson by his pressing invitations had been responsible for the loss of the Sisters to New South Wales. Faithful to his life-long practice the Bishop refused to use the press for personal explanation or defence. But to Father McEncroe he wrote:—

"It would appear from the statement given that the Sisters of Charity left Sydney, in 1847, solely in consequence of my invitation. That is not the fact—far from it. Dr. Gregory's letter to Mrs. Williams [Sister M. Xavier] dated April 22nd, 1847, proves this incontestably. Nor do I think the statement regarding the excellent Christian Brothers is exactly correct; and this opinion arises from a letter addressed to my Vicar-General by these good men when they offered their services at Hobarton".

Many leading ecclesiastics in Sydney and all in other parts of Australia held the opinion that Dr. Willson had nothing whatever to do with the decision of the Sisters to abandon their first field of action. There existed, in fact, a fairly general belief that the Vicar-General of the Archdiocese—Dr. Gregory—had a tendency to interfere without warrant or justification not only in local affairs, but also in the concerns of the suffragan dioceses. On this very subject Bishop Murphy of Adelaide wrote more than once to Dr. Willson. The Bishop of Melbourne, the Most Rev. Dr. Goold, likewise felt aggrieved³:—

³*Willson Papers.*

"The Archbishop appears to be under a strange influence which leads him to do things inconsistent with the rights and interests of other dioceses. I have lately felt the baneful effect of this influence—but in time to stop it. If it were exercised openly and with my knowledge I would not feel so displeased. Letters have been written without my knowledge to the Government in order to procure a right of interference, which would upset my control over the stipends and appointments of the clergymen living under my jurisdiction. Whilst I was allowed the unimportant privilege of applying for land for Church purposes, these private letters went to deprive me of the important right of asking aid from the Colonial funds for the building of churches and the support of clergymen, except through, and with the sanction of, the Archbishop. I wrote to Dr. Polding on this subject, and received an evasive reply. I have written to the Government, stating that I would rather decline all correspondence with the Executive than submit to this arrangement. They have quite enough to occupy them in Sydney, without meddling with the affairs of this diocese. I believe the Archbishop is no party to this unpleasant business".

Fully convinced that Abbot Gregory did not possess in any marked degree the first of the cardinal virtues Dr. Willson thought it desirable to open his mind to the Archbishop of Sydney:—

"When I reflect on the removal of the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, and on his treatment of the Sisters of Charity now in Hobart Town...and several other circumstances that could be mentioned, I must confess that I have no confidence in his judgment or prudence. I really feel compelled to say that I believe he has been a great bar to the peace and welfare of the Church in this Province. He is, no doubt, a pious, virtuous man; but for reasons remarked upon by Bishops, learned ecclesiastics in Europe who know him well, and others, he has not the necessary qualifications for the post he occupies. My Lord Archbishop, what I now say causes me great pain—but when I see the interests of religion exposed to danger, even to my own flock, and that, too, from what I conscientiously believe to be the want of judgment and prudence in this gentleman, I cannot remain silent, whatever may be the consequence. . . ."

Is Dr. Willson here guilty of meddling with the concerns of another Bishop's subject? Be that as it may he had no wish to hide his criticism from him whom he censured. He asked the Archbishop to show the letter to Dr. Gregory. The Abbot replied to the Hobart prelate, not in terms of resentment, but rather giving credit for frankness and sincerity. "With reference to my treatment of the Sisters of Charity, my having expelled them", he said, "they themselves know in their inmost hearts how untrue it is. . . . I have no doubt the Archbishop will himself write, if he has not already done so, the history of Mrs. de Lacy's departure, etc., in which, though I figure most prominently in the *Freeman's Journal* as the cause, I had no part, as I have already made known to the world through the press. . . .

"I wish, my Lord, in writing to His Grace you had mentioned the proceedings which you believe to have had such a blighting effect on the interests of religion, and which have so strongly impressed Your Lordship to my disfavour: for whatever the humiliation may be to me, or whatever self-sacrifice be required, I have sufficient confidence in

God's merciful extension of grace to me, that I hope to bear silently and patiently this trial. Yours, my dear Lord, has been a painful duty; but you have spoken plainly and honestly. If others had been as outspoken, instead of pretending things to me, when they had other and far different impressions in their hearts, you would not have been deceived, and I should not have been the victim of calumny...."

The Bishop did not alter his opinion. About this particular episode—so fraught with interest for his own diocese—he adhered to the view already expressed:—

"From the tenor of your letter it appears that I am wrong in supposing you were the cause of the Nuns, now in Hobart Town, leaving Sydney in 1847. Certainly that has been the impression I have always entertained, and since receiving your letter that impression has been much strengthened by a conversation I have had with Sister Mary Xavier (Mrs. Williams). Had I learnt from her that I had been in error I would have gladly made you all the reparation I could—but I am still of opinion it is truth, not calumny that guides me.

"The testimony of Mrs. Williams (who had not given you offence on other matters) is so clear and strong on this head and borne out as it is by your own letter to her, when she had been appointed by you the Superioress, in place of Mrs. O'Brien [Sister de Sales] that no impartial person can, I imagine, doubt of the unhappy cause that led to their exodus. She soon repented, she says of her consent to the change proposed—seeing that she could not fulfil the vows she had taken in her mother-house in Dublin—and before leaving for Hobart Town, that Mrs. de Lacy [Sister Baptist] also did the same. Calumny, then, my dear friend, has not caused me to form the opinion I have on this untoward circumstance. In fact, your own refusal to allow them to remain in N.S. Wales until the return of the Archbishop, alone is conclusive were other evidence wanting.

"You tell me most properly that we are verging on the grave—it, therefore, behoves us, I apprehend, to review our actions, and polity in ecclesiastical matters through the proper medium; and I am of opinion, if this be done, you will see the separating, at the antipodes of their native land, of these Nuns, now also verging on the grave, from their Sisters in Religion, and from the property that has been legally secured them *in perpetuity* towards their comfort and support in old age, was, to say the least, a strong measure,—in fact, so strong that no other could have been adopted, even had they been unfaithful to their vows. How far reparation to them is due I will not undertake to say. I can only remark that now when they are verging on the grave, far away from home and kindred, without provision from the Church (and from the poverty of my mission, not relieved by Mr. Therry's debt still pressing heavily on me) there is no prospect of my being in a position to aid them. To me these appear to be facts of weighty interest....

"I cannot omit adding that the news of the unhappy state of things in Sydney has reached even this remote place [Port Arthur], where I am writing. One of the principal officers here, who was several years in N.S. Wales, and whose friends are still there, is full of this intelligence—and as in Norfolk Island, that which is known to one here is common to all..."

Here let us leave Abbot Gregory, bearing crosses which were neither few nor light, and turn our thoughts back to the Sisters of Charity in Hobart. Bishop Willson hearing in London the news of Sydney's loss and Tasmania's gain at once wrote to Archbishop Murray of Dublin thanking him for his generosity in having given to the

Australian Church such valuable subjects. To Mother Aikenhead he recounted the full story of the Sisters' life in New South Wales, promising to do all in his power to make them happy in their new mission. Very interested as usual in everything relating to the pioneer nuns of Australia their benefactor and former spiritual father, Dr. Ullathorne, wrote to Sister de Sales O'Brien: "You will be with my dear friend Bishop Willson whom I have come to London to see before he leaves again for Hobart Town. I am sure you will be happy under his guidance. I do not forget you though so wide apart".

Returned from Europe in 1848 the Bishop did not find his flock altogether free from discord: but one real consolation he knew. His apostolic workers had been increased by the addition of a select band of devoted women, vowed to serve, to do, and to teach. Visiting St. Joseph's Convent on the very day of his disembarkation, Dr. Willson gave the community his blessing with a guarantee of complete freedom to live according to the rules and the spirit of their Institute. Gifts from Irish convents together with an affectionate letter from Mother Aikenhead brought joy and comfort to the three heroic Sisters. Mother Aikenhead, in turn, had reason to rejoice when letters from the Bishop gave the assurance that her twice exiled children were steadfastly following the pathway marked out for them by the Divine Master⁴:—

"I am on the point of sailing for Norfolk Island; but before I do so I will take the liberty of addressing a few lines to you by way of reparation to my dearly valued friends, the Sisters of Charity, who by their labours and holy example are aiding so much in my peculiar and arduous mission. Permit me, then, to state how edified I am by these excellent Religious. It is impossible for me to express to you the comfort I derive, or the comfort this flock reaps, from their labours.

"Sensible, prudent, humble, fervent, and cheerful their holy lives are a continued lesson in edification; and my only regret is that I have not more to aid them".

What were the Sisters' chief duties in the missionary field? Father Hall enumerates some of their tasks: "Besides attending to the public institutions you will also, no doubt, give some care to my poor free women, and above all will take care of the supervision of my dear little girls. All these are much in want of your attention and care. I can find no one to have a proper care of them; and then, they are exposed to so many dangers, temptations, and so much bad example". In the houses of detention, at the Queen's Orphan School, in giving public and private instructions, the zeal of the Sisters won the Bishop's unbounded admiration. In his letter already quoted, of 8th September, 1849, he informed Mother Aikenhead:

⁴Kelsh, *Memoir of Bishop Willson* (Hobart, 1882).

"Not less than 500 prisoners in Hobart Town derive benefit from their visits and instructions. Fully 100 female orphans are also visited by them. Then they have their own school with an average of about 80 daily; and besides, the common jail where the poor men are executed; also the hospital, and infirmary for aged females to visit. What a harvest! My only regret is that I have it not in my power to do all for my dear Sisters that I could wish".

Though the Sisters had been granted official permission to visit the different Government establishments at convenient times to afford religious and moral instructions to Catholics, yet there remained many obstacles to be overcome, especially in the earlier stages of their ministrations. Prejudice and suspicion met them at every turn. In the public hospital they were forbidden "to communicate either directly or indirectly with the Protestant women".⁵ Not for long could the spirit behind such regulations survive. As their message of Christian charity became known and appreciated the Sisters won the respect and goodwill of all sections of the city's population. Naturally the Catholic people sounded the praises of these consecrated virgins. The clergy, particularly those responsible for the spiritual training of little children, never ceased to speak gratefully of the services rendered to religion by their self-sacrific and constant devotion.

Going their daily rounds rejoicing, praying, suffering, the Sisters, with the Bishop as guide and kind father, struggled on through the years. With the young recruits whom they had left in Sydney to keep the Institute there alive, as also with Ireland, they kept up a loving correspondence. None the less their sense of isolation must have been very real. What had the future in store? Would the community survive, or were the Sisters doomed to extinction leaving nothing behind except the memory of a noble enterprise? Two postulants died, and only one Sister made profession during Bishop Willson's lifetime.⁶ Prophets said the little seed would not take root. Time proved the prophets had misread the signs.

The Bishop appointed Sister John Cahill first Superior at St. Joseph's Convent. Her love for the poor and for straying souls accomplished in old Hobart marvels of reform and conversion even more remarkable than had been recorded during eight years of zealous missionary work in New South Wales. She was the first of the pioneers to answer the call "*Veni, Sponsa Mea: come my spouse*". Dr. Willson's diary for April 11th, 1864, has this entry: "Visited Sister Mary John who is in a dying state". On Wednesday, 13th, the end came: "Sister

⁵*Convict Correspondence* large vol. of letters, 1844-1855, in *Hobart Archives*.

⁶M Joseph O'Farrell.

Mary John Cahill died about 10.30 this morning". Then on the 15th we read: "High Mass at St. Joseph's and *libera* for Mother Mary John, who was then interred in the cemetery". Priests from all parts of the Island assembled at Hobart to manifest their respect for the deceased servant of God and to offer the Holy Sacrifice for her soul.

As a Sister had made her vows in 1853 the community once more consisted of three members with Sister de Sales O'Brien the Superior—an office which she held until her death in 1871. The story of growth and development lies outside the scope of this article. It is a story which tells of unbounded confidence in Divine Providence. The third Superior, Mother Xavier Willams, had to provide accommodation for twelve professed Sisters and one novice before her death which took place in 1892. She had been privileged to see the answer to her constant prayer—the re-union of all the Sisters of Charity under Mother Francis McGuigan, the first Australian-born Mother General.

(To be continued)

JOHN H. CULLEN.

Dogmatic Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS, XI. THE OFFERERS OF THE SACRIFICE (cont.) THE CHURCH OFFERING.

In two previous articles (Oct., 1952, Jan., 1953) we considered the part of Christ our High Priest in the actual oblation of every Sacrifice of the Mass. We now concentrate on the part of the Church in offering the Sacrifice to the adorable Trinity.

The Sacrifice of the Mass is the supreme act of worship of *the whole Mystical Body* presided over by its priestly Head. In this it differs from that other Sacrifice of Calvary, in which Christ alone was Priest in solitary splendour. There He made the vicarious oblation of Himself for our redemption. His Mystical Body did not co-operate in the oblation of that supreme Sacrifice, because the Body was not yet His in actuality. Carrying our sins upon the Cross, He carried us as a dead weight, a Body to be vivified, purchased and sanctified by His blood. In a certain sense He had conceived us all at the moment of the Incarnation, by which He was constituted Head and Priest, but up to the time of His redeeming-death He carried us in His spiritual loins,—members to be brought forth by the pangs of His Passion.¹

Upon the Cross He gave supreme worship to God, His Father. Yet, the Son of God did not become man in order to offer solitary adoration to the Father, but in order to *unite us with Himself in the perfect worship of God*. And He merited this union, this perfect fellowship of adorers, by His Sacrifice on Calvary. For, there He merited the sending-forth of the Holy Ghost, who, as the bond of perfect union, drew the members to the priestly Head, uniting the whole Body with Him in one living, organic, supernatural Body dedicated to the perfect worship of God. So Christ gained His spouse, the Church; so the Head acquired His members, and the *Whole Christ*, Head and members, became an eternal reality.

All the members of the Body, being drawn into fellowship with Christ in perfect solidarity, partake of the dignity, offices and prerogatives of the Head. Since He is Priest, the whole Body is a priestly Body. Since He is King, the whole Body is a kingly Body. And since

¹In theological terms, we were His members in potentia, later to become, by His merits, members in actu.

He is victim. the whole Body is a victim-Body. What the Head is, so the members must be, for they are all one in Him. "You are one in Christ", says St. Paul; that is, one mystical person.² And St. Peter reminds us: "You are a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people".³

Now, having united us with Himself as the perfect adorers of God, Christ gave us the great Sacrifice of the Mass as *the means of offering perfect worship to the Father*. And since all the members are drawn into fellowship with Him, all without exception must be, in some degree at least, what He is in relation to the Mass. But what is Christ the Head in the Mass? He is Priest, and victim mystically immolated. Therefore all the members must be, in some degree, priests of the Sacrifice and victims mystically immolated with Christ. "The Sacrifice of the New Law", says Pope Pius XII, "is the supreme worship in which Christ as principal Offerer, and together with Him and through Him *all His mystical members* adore and venerate God, giving Him the honour due to Him".⁴ That is the greatest glory of Christianity, and the source of all its vitality and sanctity. The appalling thing is that it is so little known in our day, with the calamitous result that the Mass, given by Christ to be the mighty heart-beat of the whole Mystical Body, has become a distant, impersonal rite viewed from afar by a crowd of lethargic members unconscious of their dignity as members of Christ, the Priest.

Fear of error grips the sons of God when they come to consider the Mass as the act of worship of the *whole Body*. A saintly and venerable priest recently dismissed the subject with this remark: "Who consecrates the Body and Blood of Christ? No one but the Priest! So don't talk about the people offering the Sacrifice of the Mass!" But it is a doctrine of our Catholic Faith, though not a dogma, that all the members do, in some real way, offer the Sacrifice. The only question is: in what way, precisely? The fearful reaction, or prejudice, against the doctrine that was the very soul of the Church's worship in early centuries is a curse put upon us by the reformation. The Reformers, having sacrilegiously removed the Sacrifice of the Mass, gave out the heresy that "all christians without distinction are priests of the New Law, all endowed with equal spiritual power".⁵ The Council of Trent

²Galatians, 3. 28.

³I Peter, 2, 9.

⁴Encyc. Mediator Dei, ASS., 1947, p. 555.

⁵Cf. Denzinger, 960.

condemned this heresy, and defined the *essential distinction* between priests and laity, a distinction founded on the Sacrament of Orders instituted by Christ.⁶ Then the reaction set in; the pendulum swung violently to the extreme opposed to the Protestant heresy, any and every active co-operation of the laity in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice began to be excluded, and the great traditional doctrine was so obscured that it was practically lost. This reaction, readily appreciated as an historical phenomenon, was one of the worst blows, if not the worst of all, suffered by the Church during her passion at the hands of heretics. It is for us to recapture the truth, found as always between the two extremes, and, with it, to pour into the Mystical Body all that vitality and unity of worship that Christ our Head meant it to have when He instituted the Mass as the Sacrifice to be offered to God by the whole Body.^{6a}

It is not allowed to dismiss the subject with the remark of our esteemed friend quoted above: "The priest alone consecrates the Body and Blood of Christ, therefore the priest alone offers the Sacrifice". The inference is not lawful, because it ignores the fact that three things take place in the Consecration : firstly, Christ is rendered present ; secondly, Christ is sacrificially immolated ; thirdly, Christ immolated is offered (= oblatus) to the eternal Father. Three distinct formalities in the one material action. And if the faithful are excluded from the first and second (as they surely are excluded), it does not follow that they are excluded from the third. In fact, they are not excluded from the act of oblation, as we shall see. It is perfectly true that all the faithful of all times united in one concentrated effort could never give us so much as one Sacrifice of the Mass, because they could never give us the Victim, let alone sacrificially immolate Him. The essential distinction

⁶Ibid, 960, 966.

^{6a}In his Encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, the Sovereign Pontiff, deplors the exaggeration of some who would swing the pendulum back near the heretical position, "holding a view not far removed from errors already condemned, teaching that the New Testament knows no other priesthood than that common to all the baptized; that the command which Jesus Christ gave to His Apostles at the Last Supper... was addressed directly to the whole community of the faithful; and that thence and only later the hierarchical priesthood took its rise. They therefore maintain that the people possesses the true priestly power, and that the priest acts only in virtue of a function delegated to him by the community. Consequently they consider the Eucharistic Sacrifice as a true 'concelebration', and think it is much better for priests to assist and 'concelebrate' with the people, rather than to offer the sacrifice privately when the people are not present". Someone, we recall, wrote a book entitled "Theology and Sanity"!

between them and God's anointed is divine and eternal. But that does not exclude them from an active part in the Sacrifice.

Let us consider the part played by each in the great Eucharistic drama, and we shall see that, everything being placed in its right perspective, there is no cause for fear or anxiety, but only for joy and gratitude.

THE PRIEST AND THE SACRIFICE

Since it is a dogma of faith that Christ offers the Eucharistic Sacrifice "by the ministry of His priests",⁷ we must first try to determine what that ministry is. It is clear that the priest alone, as the instrumental agent of Christ, renders Christ the Victim really present on the Altar by the words of Consecration. We must then consider the priest in relation to the two essentials of the Sacrifice: immolation and oblation.

As regards the immolation of the Victim: it must be held that the priest alone, no one else, sacrificially immolates the Victim of the Sacrifice. He alone is consecrated and deputed by God to shed the Blood of the Immaculate Lamb on the Altar. He alone has the power efficaciously to pronounce the words by whose virtue, as by a verbal sword, there is effected the sacramental separation of the Body and Blood beneath the separated species and the sacramental renewal of the bloody immolation of Calvary. By reason of the character of priesthood indelibly impressed on his soul the priest is not a teacher of morality, not a philosopher nor a theologian. He is a man of Blood. He is anointed by God to shed Blood, through love, as He did whose Blood he sheds.

Christ, it is true, wills that the word-sword should be used whenever it is used. He wills to be placed in the formal state of victimhood in every Mass; and in this sense it must be said that He voluntarily immolates Himself through the medium of the priest. But the priest alone *immediately immolates the Victim*; alone he places the formal constituent of the Sacrifice. He is the only member of the Mystical Body deputed to this action. The faithful neither mediately nor immediately concur in it. In this sense we understand the words of the Council of Trent: "Christ left Himself to be immolated by the Church through the priests".⁸ And that is the interpretation of Pope Pius XII, who writes: "The unbloody immolation by which... Christ is rendered present on the altar in the state of victim, is performed by the priest

⁷Denzinger, 938.

⁸Ibid.

alone, and by the priest in so far as he acts in the name of Christ, not in so far as he represents the faithful".⁹

Although the priest is subordinate to Christ, as an instrument used by Him, yet in a very true way Christ is subject to the priest. He depends on His priest to be rendered present in the state of victimhood, and He conforms His will to the will of the priest who, whenever he wills, wherever he wills, and as often as he wills, draws down into his hands the Incarnate Word and sheds His Blood for the remission of sins. Apart from His Mother and St. Joseph, the priest is the only person ever on this earth to whom Christ subjects Himself! So much for the office of the priest as regards the formal constituent of the Sacrifice, the immolation of the divine Victim.

As regards the oblation of the immolated Victim:

The Priest alone, of all the members of the Body, and in the name of the whole Body, *IMMEDIATELY* offers the immolated Victim to the triune God. He is the one and only visible member deputed to perform this action. He is the ambassador of the whole Body with God, the voice of the Church, the tongue of the people. And he holds this pre-eminent position in the Body by virtue of his priestly consecration, which is a *divine consecration*, not a mere deputation by the members of the Body. "For, every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins". (Heb. 5, 1). He is the true mediator between the people and God, exercising his priesthood in the heavenward direction by the offering of the only Sacrifice acceptable to God, and in the earthward direction by drawing down upon the whole Body the copious fruits of the all-pleasing Sacrifice. Christ, it is true, also makes the *IMMEDIATE* oblation of Himself, as we have seen. But, at the same time, the priest *IMMEDIATELY* offers with Christ, as the one *VISIBLE* member deputed by God to this action, and his oblation becomes one with that of the eternal High Priest. These two, Christ and His priest, are not only inseparable; they are as one person through the sacramental consecration and union by which the priest takes on the person of Christ,—a union nowhere more vividly expressed than in those portentous words: "This is my Body, this is my Blood". The priest lends his tongue to the Word-Incarnate, and the Word-Incarnate lends His to the priest. These two are as one in the sublime dignity and divine power of priesthood.

⁹Encyc. Mediator Dei, loc. cit.

As to the manner in which the people, the other members of the Body, concur in the oblation of the Sacrifice, we shall determine later. Meanwhile, it is in order here briefly to recall the profound and wonderful doctrine of the priestly Character impressed in the Sacrament of Holy Orders. With deep humility let us consider our greatness.

THE CHARACTER OF PRIESTHOOD.

There is but one priesthood in the New Law,—that of Jesus Christ, who, at the moment of the Incarnation was constituted supreme mediator between God and man. Now, Christ was not merely proclaimed a priest, nor was He made a priest by a mere moral deputation to the cult of God. No! He was made a priest by the hypostatic union, wherein His sacred humanity was consecrated by the very Divinity itself. The Divinity itself anointed the humanity that it assumed, consecrating it in every part and deputing it physically to the supreme cult of God. Christ our Lord did not have the character of priesthood, which is of its very nature a *participation* in priesthood. He was priest by nature, possessing in Himself the formal plenitude of priesthood.

Now, since His is the only priesthood of the New Law, no one can be a priest except by receiving a share in Christ's own priesthood. Consequently, when He had instituted the Sacrifice of the New Law, the Mass, which demanded lawfully constituted priests to offer it perpetually, He had to admit men, chosen by Himself, to a participation in His own priesthood. This He did when He instituted the Sacrament of Holy Orders after He had instituted the Sacrifice of the Mass at the Last Supper.

This dignity and power of priesthood is not a mere title, nor is it a mere moral deputation to perform acts of worship, particularly sacrifice. No! As with Christ in the hypostatic union, so the priest is constituted by *the physical-spiritual consecration* which he receives in the Sacrament of Ordination. And that consecration irrevocably and eternally bestows on him a physical participation in the priestly powers, prerogatives, functions and dignity of Christ Himself. This physical-spiritual consecration, divinely effected, consists in the Sacramental Character of priesthood indelibly impressed on the soul. It is in virtue of this sacred Character that the priest performs his sacred duties. For, let us never forget it, the Character is *A SPIRITUAL POTENCY*, as real as the potency of intellect in the natural order. A man cannot think if he does not possess an intellect, which is the potency whence he derives his power of thought. Similarly, the character of priesthood is

a spiritual potency implanted by God, through the Sacrament, in the soul of the priest, whence he derives his stupendous spiritual powers and exercises priestly actions. This it is that constitutes him in his priestly being and dedicates him effectively and irrevocably to the cult of God, even as Christ's humanity was so dedicated when it was anointed by the Divinity and subsisted in the Person of the Word, to whom it eternally belongs and for whom it lives and operates.

Thus the Character of priesthood is, as St. Thomas points out, a participation of the priesthood of Christ and a configuration to Christ the Priest.¹⁰ We might with profit develop that thought yet further, by seeing how the hypostatic union constituted Christ a Priest and how the Character reproduces in the priest's soul, by participation, the same consecration and powers.

A priest is a mediator between the two extremes, God and men,—the offering of Sacrifice being his supreme act and means of mediation. Now, in order that one be constituted a *perfect priest-mediator* three things are required. Firstly, he must be an *ontological medium* between the two extremes to be reconciled; that is, he must by some positive reality differ from each of them. And this is called by the theologians "*esse sacerdotale*", priestly being. We say he must differ from the two extremes by some *positive, entitative reality*, remembering that his deputation to the cult of God is not a mere *moral deputation*, or nomination, but a physical-spiritual consecration. Secondly, he must be a *moral medium*; that is, he must be capable of performing an action that will effectively reconcile the two extremes, God and men. And this is called by the theologians "*posse sacerdotale*", priestly activity. Thirdly, he must be possessed of sanctity, so that his action be pleasing to God in every respect,—not only as a priestly action, but as an action of one who is holy before God, to whom men are to be reconciled. And this the theologians call "*bene posse sacerdotale*", the holy performance of priestly activity.

Now, applying all this to Christ our Lord we see that the hypostatic union effected those three realities in His hypostatized human nature, thus constituting Him the perfect Priest-Mediator. Firstly, by that ineffable union Christ was rendered an ontological medium between God and men, because in His hypostatized human nature He differed from the two extremes: He differed from God because His human nature (in which He is formally a priest) was a creature; He was distant also from

¹⁰Cf. S. Theol., 3, 63, 3.

men, by the greatest of all ontological realities, because His human nature was physically united to the Divinity and substantially consecrated by the Divinity itself. Thus He was possessed of priestly being (*esse sacerdotale*) and priestly consecration in a unique and ineffable way.

Similarly, by virtue of the Union itself Christ was made a moral medium between God and men, possessing a priestly action (*posse sacerdotale*) capable of reconciling the two extremes. For, every action of that hypostatized human nature was of infinite moral worth and dignity, because of the infinite value and dignity of the Divine Person who subsisted in that nature, and therefore infinitely meritorious and pleasing to God the Father. Thus Christ the Priest was able to placate and make reparation to God. This He did by offering His supreme Sacrifice of propitiation, in which was verified His priestly mediation in the heaven-ward direction. And He was equally capable of bringing to men the divine gifts of mercy, forgiveness and love (the fruits of His Sacrifice), in which was verified His priestly mediation in the earth-ward direction. And thus He reconciled the two extremes in an embrace of friendship and love.

Thirdly, the hypostatic union demanded that Christ's human nature be filled with the formal plenitude of sanctifying grace and of all the supernatural gifts and virtues, for it was the humanity of God Himself. Now, this meant that the priestly actions of Christ were pleasing to God *in every respect*. That is, not alone as priestly actions, not alone because they had infinite worth and merit because of the Person of the Word subsisting in that human nature, but also because they came forth from a soul and faculties supremely supernaturalized and sanctified by the abiding gifts of grace and the virtues. And thus, the priestly activity of Christ was perfectly pleasing to God in its every aspect (*bene posse sacerdotale*).

Hence by the hypostatic union Christ was essentially and formally constituted a High Priest, having in Himself the full and formal plenitude of the Priesthood of the New Law. Unique, sublime, and inexpressible was His priestly consecration, for that which consecrated Him was the divinity itself. Unique and ineffable was His priestly activity, His every action of divine cult, because it was of infinite moral value and dignity, and because it came forth from a soul so holy that God Himself could not sanctify it further.

Such is Christ our High Priest.

Now, since the Character of Priesthood is essentially a participation of the Priesthood of Christ and a configuration of the soul to Christ the Priest, it must confer upon us priests all the realities and wonders that the hypostatic union conferred on Christ when it constituted Him a Priest—though, of course, in a limited way, for it is a participation of His plenitude. And it does just that.

Firstly, the Character confers “*esse sacerdotale*”, priestly being, rendering the recipient an ontological medium between God and men. For, the Character is a physical-spiritual reality impressed upon the soul, consecrating it entirely and irrevocably dedicating it to the service of God in divine worship. By that ontological consecration the priest differs from the two extremes to be reconciled: from God, because this consecration is a finite, created charism placed in the soul by God; from other men, because they lack this divine consecration and deputation.¹¹ Thus is had a real, physical participation in Christ’s own priestly Consecration.^{12N.B.}

Secondly, the Character confers “*posse sacerdotale*”, effective priestly activity. For, as we have said, the Character is essentially a physical-spiritual potency, a real principle of priestly actions, even as the intellect in the natural order is a principle of intellectual operations. Thus the priest is ever capable of reconciling the two extremes, God and men. This he does primarily by the offering of the Sacrifice of Mass, in which he exercizes his priestly mediation both in a heaven-ward and an earth-ward direction, even as Christ. “The priest,” says St. Thomas, is constituted a medium between God and the people; hence just as it belongs to him to offer the gifts of the people, so it pertains to him to bring down divine gifts to the people’.¹³

Thirdly, the Character morally demands an abundance of sanctifying grace and a copious out-pouring of the gifts and virtues upon the soul of the priest, (even as the hypostatic union demanded the plenitude of sanctity in Christ) in order that he may holily perform his sacred duties. And this demand is lavishly met by God who generously endows with grace those whom he deposes by such a consecration to

¹¹Cr. S. Theol., 3, 63, 6, ad 2^{um}.

¹²Christ could have assigned men to be priests by a mere *moral* deputation, as opposed to a real, physical-spiritual consecration and deputation. But He wished to give us a *perfect* sharing in His Priesthood; and that is had only by a *physical* sharing in His priestly consecration. Similarly, when He willed to draw us into union with Himself, He did so not by mere moral bonds, but by real, physical-spiritual bonds, making us His members in the Mystical Body.

¹³S. Theol., 3, 82, 3; cf. 3, 60, 5.

such an exalted office. For, together with the Character, the sacrament of Ordination confers this abundance of grace and virtues; and moreover, the Character itself is a special title to special graces whenever a priest may need them in order to perform worthily his sacred office. Thus is had "*bene posse sacerdotale*", perfect priestly actions, perfectly pleasing to God, not only because they come forth from the spiritual potency which is a physical participation of Christ's priesthood, but also because they come from a soul richly adorned with grace and the supernatural virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghost. The Character is the pearl of great price set in the golden ring of grace adorned with the gems of virtues and gifts infused by the Holy Ghost. "God", says St. Thomas, "perfectly provides for men in the sacraments; hence together with the Character, by which it is given to man to exercise spiritual actions, there is given grace by which he may worthily perform those actions".¹⁴

Such is the marvellous drama of divine power and sanctity enacted in the soul of the priest by the Character of Ordination. It is a created reproduction of the hypostatic union. And, like the hypostatic union itself, it will last forever: "The Lord hath sworn and He will not retract: Thou art a priest forever". What the hypostatic union was to Christ the Priest, that the Character is to us who were chosen and eternally predestined with Him and in Him to be partakers of His eternal Priesthood. We continue His Priesthood; we are the extension of the Incarnate Word through the centuries; we are the living images of Christ the Priest; we act in His name and in His Person, and our acts of divine worship are analogous to those of the great High Priest.

What a wealth of theological truth is summed up in those words: "the Character is a participation of the Priesthood of Christ, and an assimilation of the soul to Christ the High Priest"! Space will not permit us to develop this truth any further. But let us remember, no matter what might be said to the contrary, that our priestly consecration and state is incomparably above any dedication to God made by vows of any kind whatsoever. To deny this is to manifest a lamentable ignorance of theological truth. No consecration to God is comparable with the spiritual-physical consecration given by the priestly Character, for it is a physical-spiritual participation in Christ's own priestly Consecration, and an absolutely irrevocable dedication to the cult of God through powers and actions that not even the angels dreamed of. No wonder the saints grew speechless when they tried to describe such a prodigy

¹⁴Sent., d. 4, Q 1, a 1; Cf. S. Theol., 3, 63, 4, ad 1^{um}.

as the priest is, for Christ has wrought two marvels in His Church above all others: one is Mary His Mother, and the other is the priest; and his greatness is seen best when it is seen through her's.

It is by virtue of the Character of Ordination, then, that the priest renews the Sacrifice of Redemption on our altars in the way we have described. It is by the Character that he becomes the divinely deputed organ of life, growth and restoration in the whole Mystical Body by the administration of the sacraments. It is by reason of the Character that his whole life must be dedicated solely to God's service, even as Christ's human nature (in which He is priest) belongs no longer to itself but totally to the Divine Person of the Word, in Whom and for Whom alone it lives and acts eternally.

Haec cogita, haec meditare,
Tu praesertim, O Sacerdos;
Et satage ut vincas, ut triumphes,
Ut glorificeris, et coroneris,
Cum Christo Sacerdote.

THOMAS MULDOON.

Moral Theology

USE OF CONFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

If a priest with the care of souls has the knowledge from the confessional—knowledge most unlikely to be acquired *aliunde*—that a certain and most serious sin is rife in his parish, what should he do? Is it obligatory or forbidden or commendable for him to make use of this knowledge to help stamp out the evil, without, of course, any danger of violation of the *sigillum*. For example, would he be obliged (or forbidden) to refer to the sin a little more frequently in his sermons, or, if it were a question of the children, to advise the teachers in the schools to emphasise the matter?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

A pastor, who becomes aware of a serious sin prevalent among his parishioners, would be bound to take what steps he could to suppress the evil. The means adopted, however, must be in accord with the nature of the case; and the exercise of zeal must sometimes be restrained because of the danger of greater harm. A sin which is known by many as of common occurrence could be countered by open and public measures, but one which comes under notice only from confidential communications could not be attacked in a manner which would cause a loss of reputation to those who are guilty. A betrayal of the confidence whereby the priest knew of the violations of the laws of morality must also be avoided. Should the confessional be the source of his distressing information, he needs to proceed with more than ordinary caution. When acting on knowledge gained in the course of hearing confessions, one must guard not only against breaking the seal and betraying the sinner (Can. 889), but also against anything which would be to the detriment of the penitent, even by making it more difficult for him to approach the Sacrament of Penance. (Can. 890.)

Prevalent vices, which are known from the confessional alone, can be dealt with freely with the penitents concerned during the course of confession. Outside, they are, to all intents, merely possible sins. Just as the pastor may warn his people against sin in general and particular, so he need not abstain from mentioning a common but secret vice, because he happens to know as a confessor that it is not only possible but

very much a fact. On the other hand, he would be bound not to speak about it from the pulpit in such an explicit manner or with such frequency that the guilty persons would conclude he was referring to them. To act thus would, we think, have the effect of making it more difficult for them to go to confession, and be a forbidden use of sacramental knowledge *in gravamen poenitentis*. The same remark is true about warning the teachers in the school to emphasise the matter.

To answer the query proposed. It is commendable for the pastor to exercise his zeal as a confessor in the tribunal of Penance to extirpate some secret but prevalent sin; it is good and lawful for him to pray for the conversion of his people, but it is dangerous to refer publicly to secret faults or even to mention them to others, beyond what he might reasonably do, basing his knowledge on what he knows of human nature and *communiter contingentia*. The Sacrament of Penance is the second plank after ship-wreck, and it is the mind of the Church that the faithful be not deterred from making use of it through fear that their confessions will be the occasion of subsequent embarrassment.

*

*

*

*

JURISDICTION FOR CONFESSIONS IN COMMON ERROR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Father Titius, a Religious priest, normally engaged in giving missions, etc., in various dioceses, comes from time to time for a short while to one of the houses of his Institute. He is not a member of this community, but it is usual for the local superior to request faculties for him from the Ordinary of the Diocese, and during his stay he frequently hears confession in the church attached to the monastery. Once, however, the superior had not obtained the faculties and Father Titius was unaware of the omission. When approached by one of the faithful for confession, Father Titius obliges. Was the Confession valid and lawful? If the priest did know that he had not yet received the faculties from the Bishop, would the answer be the same?

PRESBYTER.

REPLY.

In the first case, the confession was both valid and lawful. It was valid, because the Church supplies jurisdiction in common error: it was lawful since Father Titius acted in good faith. Common error would also make for the validity of the confession, even when the priest knew

he had not received faculties from the local Ordinary; but, unless there was some urgency, the confession would be unlawful.

According to can. 209 of the Code, the Church supplies jurisdiction in the case of common error. *Error* is a false judgment. In this instance, it is the judgment that a certain priest has faculties for confessions, when in fact he has not such faculties. An error is *common*, when the community at large, or a fair proportion of its members reasonably conclude that the priest is approved for confessions. A reasonable judgment supposes evidence on which it is based. It is not improbable that a fair number of pious folk consider that every priest can hear confessions. This state of mind does not result from evidence but from ignorance, and is no basis for *common error*. Some external sign must have been given whence the people are led to the decision that Father Titius is an authorised confessor. An example would be the announcement by the parish priest that Father Titius would be available for confessions at a certain time, or again, the fact that, with the knowledge of the local clergy, the visiting priest occupies one of the confessionals. If Father Titius, during his previous periodical visits, always heard confessions, it seems that there is reason to believe that he may hear them on this occasion also. While it is not yet common knowledge that a priest from another diocese is hearing confessions, once the fact takes place which provides a ground for a reasonable deduction that he is duly approved for confessions, the error is said to be common *de iure*, and such is probably and therefore practically sufficient to secure the validity of the confessions of all who come to him. When it is a well-known fact that he is hearing confessions, the error is common *de facto*, and there is no room for any doubt about the validity of the confessions.

In the case submitted, we have common error not merely *de iure*, but *de facto*. The people of the locality know that Father Titius has always heard confessions in the past, when he was a guest at the monastery. His past actions are the basis of their mistaken idea that he can hear confessions now. Who can say that this is not a reasonable basis for their conviction? We may note that the foundation of common error here is not the fact that Father Titius proceeded to hear the confession when requested, but his actions in the past. We do not think an unknown visiting priest, performing his devotions in an empty church, would give a ground for common error, merely by going to the confessional, if asked to hear the confession of one of the faithful who happen-

ed to come and find him there. The community at large do not know of him, and in the circumstances have no means of coming to any conclusion, right or wrong, about his status as a confessor.

The reason for the law of jurisdiction supplied in common error is the same as for every other law—the common good. If the necessity of the community would require that a priest who has faculties only because of common error should hear confessions, he may do so. A missionary for whom faculties have inadvertently not been requested from the local Ordinary would not, we think, be bound to abstain from hearing the confessions of those attending the mission, if a delay were entailed in applying for and receiving the faculties from the proper source.

If a priest is already considered as a confessor, may he use the faculties given him by law for the benefit of an individual, as in the case of Titius? It must be remembered that in common error jurisdiction is supplied by the Church for the good of souls, and, as it were, grudgingly. Further, supplied jurisdiction is given only *per modum actus*, for each individual confession and not habitually, as is usual when a priest is approved for confessions by the Ordinary. It would be a misuse of terms to say that a priest may *possess* faculties by reason of common error, for he is not a confessor except in the act of confession; he relies for the validity of his absolution on the jurisdiction granted here and now by Law. The necessity of the faithful and not the advantage of the priest is the reason for this generous legislation of Mother Church. Consequently, we are of opinion that some urgency would be required on the part of an isolated penitent, before a priest who knows he would give a valid absolution by virtue of supplied jurisdiction could lawfully accede to a request to hear the confession. Such urgency may be the difficulty of going to confession again for a long time, a dangerous journey, a surgical operation (which is not accompanied by danger of death), etc. The use of jurisdiction supplied by law is an extraordinary measure to which recourse should be had only for sufficient reason. To do so without a justifying cause would be an unwarranted inversion of the procedure for obtaining jurisdiction for confessions set down in can. 874 ss. The gravity of the sin involved is not so clear, as the matter is one of dispute.¹

¹Cf. Cappello. *De Sacramentis* (1943), n. 434.

THE EUCHARISTIC FAST.

Since the promulgation of the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus*, a number of queries have been submitted on the interpretation of this Document and the application of the concessions made available to priests and others. The answer to some of them was, we think, contained in what appeared in the last issue of the *RECORD*. The following, however, will be interesting to our readers.

*

*

*

*

A CASE OF BINATION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Father Smith celebrates two Masses on Sunday, the first of which begins before 9 o'clock, the second after that hour. What concessions are available for this priest from the recent Constitution of the Holy Father?

CURATE.

REPLY.

If there is an interval of an hour between the conclusion of the first Mass and the commencement of the second, there is no difficulty in allowing something between them. Father Smith fasts from midnight from all except water in preparation for his first Mass, which we will suppose commences at 8 o'clock and finishes about 8.45. His second Mass is not due to begin till after an hour, say at 10 o'clock. He may take liquid nourishment, excluding alcohol, after the conclusion of his first Mass and before an hour prior to the second, i.e., in our supposition, before 9 o'clock.

The matter is not so clear, if an hour is not to elapse between the Masses. To make the case more concrete we will suppose throughout that the first Mass is at 8.30, and the second at 10 o'clock, with an interval of approximately three-quarters of an hour only between them.

We have heard this question discussed among the clergy and have found that there are three different interpretations offered. One explanation of the pontifical Constitution is that Father Smith does not benefit at all. He says one Mass before what is regarded as a late hour, and for this he must be fasting from midnight. It is obvious that he cannot take anything between the Masses, since he has to commence the second within an hour, and so he is in the same position as before the promulgation of *Christus Dominus*, except that he may take water at will. This explanation is not unreasonable from the wording of the Constitution. It has this objection, that the priest who says two Masses, one of which

is at a late hour, derives no benefit from the concessions, while another whose duty demanded that he celebrate only one Mass, say at 10 o'clock, could take liquid refreshment up to 9 a.m. It is scarcely likely, we think, that the legislator intended to grant a concession in favour of a priest because he has to celebrate at a late hour, and deprive him of the advantage of it when he has the extra obligation of celebrating also at an hour which is not considered late. We are of opinion that the priest in question is entitled to some relaxation of the Eucharistic fast by reason of his late Mass, and its attendant inconveniences.

Another opinion voiced was that Father Smith may avail of the concession until an hour before the commencement of the second Mass, irrespective of the fast for the first. Thus, when celebrating the 10 o'clock Mass, he may take liquid nourishment, *per se*, any time before 9 o'clock; but as he will be at the altar celebrating his first Mass at that time, he is free with regard to the taking of liquids till the commencement of his first Mass at 8.30. The big difficulty here is that he is celebrating his first Mass without any fast at all, except from solids. This, it seems, is an extension of the concessions beyond what was intended. The principle underlying the Constitution and the accompanying Instruction of the Holy Office appears to be: A fast of an hour is required before Mass or Communion, except in the case of the sick. In the absence of an authentic declaration from the Holy See, exempting the priest from the law of fast before his first Mass (at 8.30), we would not subscribe to this second interpretation.

The third opinion is that Father Smith may take liquid refreshment any time prior to an hour before his first Mass, i.e., in our case before 7.30 a.m. This seems to us the most reasonable meaning of the pontifical Documents. The law of the Eucharistic fast commences for Father Smith at midnight, but because he is to celebrate Mass at 10 o'clock the next day, he is suffering an inconvenience which enables him to avail of the recent concessions. Although he is to say Mass on Sunday morning, he may take liquids after Saturday midnight as often as he desires. The question is: when must he desist? Applying the principle of an hour's fast before Mass, we would say at 7.30 a.m. when his first Mass is at half past eight.

Till such time as the position is clarified, either by discussion among the learned or a pronouncement of the Holy See, we would adopt the third opinion: Liquids may be taken after midnight, several times if desired, provided the priest is always fasting for at least an hour before

he commences Mass. This seems to be applicable, irrespective of the hour of an earlier Mass or of the interval between the Masses.

* * * *

AN AGED PRIEST AND BINATION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Father Patrick celebrates the 6 o'clock and 7 o'clock Masses on Sunday morning. At the first Mass he preaches and distributes Holy Communion to a large number. This he finds fatiguing, and because of his ripe old age, fasting and celebrating the 7 o'clock Mass is a grave inconvenience to him. Could Father Patrick have a cup of tea at 5 a.m., an hour before the commencement of the 6 o'clock Mass?

2. If his second Mass were at 8 o'clock or later, could he take a cup of tea at five and another almost at seven (i.e., an hour before each Mass)?

3. If, however, Father Patrick finds no grave difficulty in celebrating the 6 o'clock and 8 o'clock Masses, or even the 6 o'clock and 10 o'clock, am I correct in assuming that he cannot avail of the privilege (under Art. III)? In other words, must he fast from everything except natural water, since it is explicitly mentioned in the Introduction to the Constitution that the traditional discipline is still binding for those who can observe the fast?

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

1. Father Patrick is a man of ripe old age. Old age is in itself an infirmity, a fact which is recognised with regard to the reception of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction (Can. 940). We see no reason why Father Patrick could not be classed as among the sick and avail of the concessions which are at the disposal of this group (Art. I).

The Instruction of the Holy Office (n. 1) declares: The faithful who are sick, though not confined to bed, can take something in the form of drink, excluding alcoholic drinks, if, on account of their sickness they cannot without real inconvenience, remain fasting up to the time of Holy Communion. . . . In n. 3 the Instruction continues: Sick priests, even if not confined to bed, can avail themselves of the dispensation, whether they intend to celebrate Holy Mass or intend to receive Holy Communion only.

With this in mind, we offer the following solution to Father Patrick's difficulty. It is apparently no hardship for him to fast for the six o'clock Mass, and so he would be bound to do so. He cannot cele-

brate the second Mass without real difficulty, and would seem to be a fit subject for the concession before that Mass. Between the Masses, he may have some liquid nourishment. The need for an hour's fast before Mass does not apply in the case of the sick.

2. If Father Patrick's second Mass is at 8 o'clock. As the celebration of the 6 o'clock Mass is not a hardship for him, he could not take a cup of tea at 5 a.m., as suggested by our correspondent. He is not qualified on the score of infirmity (as he can fast for the first Mass), nor under the heading of fatiguing work, which must precede and not follow the celebration of Mass. With regard to the 8 o'clock Mass he could claim the concession for two reasons: fatiguing work of the ministry before Mass (the celebration of the early Mass with its attendant sermon and large number of communions), and infirmity (old age). The first would entitle him to liquid refreshment to an hour before his second Mass (7 a.m.) and the second without any limit as to time.

3. If Father Patrick were a robust man, and fasting no subjective difficulty for him, could he still use the concession and have liquid refreshment an hour before his second Mass? or must he observe the fast as hitherto, with the exception of natural water? This is one of the most obscure questions arising from the pontifical documents. Briefly it may be put thus: Some necessity is required to enjoy any of the concessions. Necessity may be accepted as grave inconvenience (*grave incommodum*). Those who can observe the Eucharist fast without grave inconvenience are bound to do so (except that they may take natural water).² The Constitution then goes on to enumerate the peculiar circumstances which are recognised as the origin or causes of the inconvenience or necessity (*necessitas, grave incommodum.*) Besides sickness they are three: fatiguing work, late hour of Mass or Communion and a journey. When do these circumstances cause sufficient inconvenience to excuse from the laws of fast as laid down in the Code? Generally it is left to the prudent judgment of the confessor to determine for each particular case, or for a priest to judge for himself; but in some instances the legislator has given an indication of his mind as to when, *iuxta communiter contingentia*, the circumstances would in themselves be considered as making the fast an *incommodum*. Thus the late hour for the celebration of Mass is stated to be after 9 a.m.

²velle etiam nos admonere, qui eidem legi obtemperare quaent, ut id facere pergant diligenter, ita quidem ut ii solummodo, qui in necessitate versantur, hisce concessionibus frui possint secundum eiusdem necessitatis rationes. (Const. *Christus Dominus.*)

To celebrate Mass at 9 o'clock means to go without food for almost ten hours, which is not easy for the average man. Likewise, a journey on foot of two kilometres is exhausting enough for a normal person to undertake before he has broken his fast. In the last issue of the *RECORD* we gave our opinion that a priest who celebrates Mass after 9 o'clock may take liquids without scruple, up to an hour before he commences Mass. We think the conclusion justified that, if the Constitution *Christus Dominus* and the Instruction of the Holy Office enumerate causes (*causae*) for a grave inconvenience, when the cause is verified, the effect is present also, and the person could avail of the concessions granted, because he is in the necessity envisaged by the legislator. It does not seem that any special personal and proper or individual inconvenience is required above that which is commonly experienced by men who find themselves in the peculiar circumstances enumerated both in the Constitution and the Instruction. For these reasons we think that Father Patrick may take liquid refreshment before a late Mass (i.e., after 9 o'clock), even though *per accidens* he is so robust that the fast would have no appreciable ill effect on him. Whether the celebration of an earlier Mass would constitute fatiguing work of the ministry to enable him to avail of the concession before a second Mass prior to 9 o'clock must be left to his own prudent judgment.

*

*

*

*

COMMUNION AT MASS AFTER MID-DAY.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Mass is celebrated at some minutes after mid-day in a City Church on holidays and greater feasts. It is very convenient for business folk to go to this Mass during their lunch hour. Does such a Mass count as an afternoon Mass for the purposes of the fast before Communion?

DUBITANS.

REPLY.

The hour for the celebration of Mass according to the law of the Code (can. 821, p. 1) is from one hour before dawn to one hour after mid-day. The Code likewise prescribes that the hours for the distribution of Communion are those during which Mass may be celebrated (can. 887, p. 4), and that a natural fast from midnight is to be observed by all who wish to be admitted to the Eucharist. (Can. 858, p. 1.)

The Constitution *Christus Dominus* authorises the local Ordinaries to permit Mass on certain days in the evening, but such Masses must not

commence before 4 o'clock in the afternoon. For those who communicate at the evening Masses, there are special regulations for the fast: abstention from solid foods for three hours, from liquids for one hour, from alcoholic drinks from mid-night (except at meals when non-spirituos beverages may be taken).

It is evident that Mass celebrated some minutes after mid-day is a 'morning Mass', and the fast for communicants at this Mass is that of the Code, with the modifications introduced by the new Constitution, *Christus Dominus*. Accordingly, persons who have had the customary breakfast could not receive holy Communion at mid-day Mass. If, in the judgment of their confessor, it is an *incommodum* for them to communicate at an earlier Mass, observing the usual fast, they may be permitted to receive the Eucharist at the mid-day Mass, keeping a fast from all solids and alcoholic drinks from mid-night and from other liquids (except water) for an hour before the time of Communion.

*

*

*

*

THE INCONVENIENCE ARISING FROM SICKNESS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In your notes on the 'Eucharistic Fast' in the April issue of the *RECORD*, you stated regarding the case of the sick: "It is sufficient that on the morning they desire to communicate, their state of health is such that they seriously doubt whether they would not have to postpone the reception of Communion, because they find fasting too difficult", (p. 144.) This seems more severe than what is contained in the Instruction: "The faithful who are sick... can take something in the form of a drink... if on account of their sickness they cannot without real inconvenience, remain fasting up to the time of Holy Communion". (p. 101.)

JEJUNANS.

REPLY.

It seems that in an attempt to be definite, the interpretation given was somewhat over strict. The intention was to stress the aspect of a 'real difficulty', without of course meaning that it should be a case of physical impossibility. Real difficulty and necessity and moral impossibility are sometimes taken as practically equivalent terms. And in fact, a person who has real difficulty about the fast will generally question within himself (or doubt) whether he would not act more prudently by taking some nourishment and postponing Communion to a more suitable occasion, when it is a question merely of a Communion of devotion.

CASES OF CO-OPERATION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Under what conditions may a Catholic lawyer plead for a client who is seeking a divorce?

2. May a Catholic lawyer working for a non-Catholic legal firm prepare a case for divorce proceedings when all or any of the conditions under which he may plead are absent? If not, is the said Catholic lawyer justified in referring a client to a non-Catholic employee of the same firm?

PETRUS.

REPLY.

1. This first question was treated rather fully in the *RECORD* in the January issue of 1950. The conclusions reached were briefly:

a) When the parties are justified in seeking a divorce, the Catholic lawyer may advise and encourage divorce proceedings, and also plead for his client. A divorce would be justified, if the parties were not validly married, but only joined in 'civil wedlock'. It could also be justified for sufficient reasons, with the approval of the ordinary, and the observance of dec. 472-3 of the Plenary Council, which demand a promise on oath that neither party will attempt another "marriage" while the present bond endures.

b) When the parties are not justified in seeking a divorce, the Catholic lawyer may not encourage them to do so. Such encouragement would be a participation in their sin.

c) If the divorce proceedings are persisted in by the client entirely on his own responsibility, the Catholic lawyer is, of course, a co-operator in the violation of the Church's rights by bringing a matrimonial case to the civil courts, and, what is worse, in making possible a union which is contrary to the divine law. Nevertheless, we concluded that his co-operation was not necessarily formal, but only material. The reason for this conclusion is that the lawyer may intend to procure what the law is competent to give, namely, a cessation of the civil rights of marriage.

d) Material co-operation in the sin of another can be lawful for sufficient reason; and so, since the solicitor does not by his actions necessarily give approval to the divorce, and still less to its consequences of a possible sinful union, he may, for sufficient reason, accept the divorce case and plead for his client in the courts.

e) This conclusion is under the supposition that there is no par-

ticular ecclesiastical law forbidding Catholic lawyers to act in divorce cases, and that in the judgment of the Ordinary there is no danger of scandal.

2. If the conditions under which a Catholic lawyer may not plead in a divorce case are not verified, the responsible head of the firm would be guilty of sin, but the malice seems to be from the *finis operantis*, not the *finis operis*. We have already decided that the action of the lawyer who is responsible for a divorce case is not necessarily evil. The assistant who prepares the case does exactly the same work, whether his principal is justified or not. The use to which the result of his efforts will be put depends on the will of another, and is capable of being directed to either good or evil. His co-operation is therefore not formal but material, and for a grave cause can be justified. This cause, in the case of an assistant, will be nearly always present, as his livelihood depends on his obedience to instructions of his employers.

The decision as to whether the case is taken will depend on the head of the firm. He is sufficiently responsible if he instructs his assistants to attend to clients who consult them for legal aid to obtain divorce. When the client has the intention of entering a further matrimonial union, he is bent on violating the divine law of the unity and indissolubility of marriage, which binds Catholics and non-Catholics alike. If the Catholic assistant could not take part in the preparation of the case, neither could the non-Catholic. It is true that the non-Catholic may not commit a formal sin, but the Catholic who incites him to break God's law would himself incur the guilt. There may be something to be said in favour of handing the case to a non-Catholic fellow employee, from the point of avoiding scandal, but otherwise we do not see how it overcomes the difficulty of the situation.

JAMES MADDEN.

Canon Law

DOMICILE OF MINOR WHO IS MARRIED.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I understand that a person who has not attained his majority necessarily shares in the domicile of his parents. Would you kindly explain the canonical position of such a person who marries and goes to live in another district? Can he acquire a domicile in this new district, or does he still retain the domicile of his parents?

PETER.

REPLY.

It should be recalled that a domicile is acquired in either of two ways—firstly, by actual residence in a parish or diocese, together with the intention of remaining there permanently unless one is called away (*Si nil avocet*), and, secondly, by actual residence in a parish or diocese which has continued for ten years. Such a domicile is *voluntary*. It is acquired by one's freely taking up residence in a certain place in the conditions specified above. A *necessary* domicile is one which is imposed by law, regardless of where a person actually takes up residence. In the Code there are three types of necessary domicile:—(i) A wife who is not legally separated from her husband shares the domicile of the husband; (ii) an insane person shares the domicile of his legal guardian; (iii) a minor shares the domicile of the parents or guardians to whom he is legally subject.

The question is whether a minor who has been married continues to have as a necessary domicile the domicile of his parents or guardians. Although there is no express provision in the Code to cover this situation, it may be concluded that a minor who is married with the consent of his parents can acquire his own voluntary domicile in either of the two ways specified by Canon 92. The minor's subjection ceases by reason of the marriage contracted with parental consent, and therefore the canonical barrier to acquiring a voluntary domicile is removed. This interpretation is borne out by the analogy of a married minor with a wife who is lawfully separated from her husband. In the Code it is provided that such a wife may acquire not only her own quasi domicile but also a voluntary domicile. It would appear that a marriage celebrated with the parents' consent breaks the legal bond which prevents a minor from acquiring a domicile in the same way as the decree of an ecclesi-

astical judge granting a legal separation resolves the legal bond by which a wife is bound to her husband and is made by law to share her husband's domicile.

If the married minor continues to live in the parental home, he may acquire there a voluntary domicile or quasi domicile, according to the principles laid down in Canon 92.

* * * *

IMPEDIMENT OF CRIME—A CONVERT'S MARRIAGE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

There is question of rectifying the marriage of a prospective convert. This lady, a Protestant, married a Protestant man who had been married and divorced previously. This man's divorced wife died recently and the possibility of regularising the present union has led the wife to act upon a long standing desire to be received into the Church.

I wish to know what procedure I must adopt in order to regularise the present marriage. I propose to do so immediately after the wife's reception into the Church. Firstly, what promises must be made in regard to the Catholic upbringing of the four children of the marriage. Secondly, should I seek a dispensation from the impediment of crime. It has been represented to me by a colleague that this impediment would not arise for non-Catholics. At any rate, it could be presumed that they would be ignorant of its existence. I have consulted an approved author and find that this impediment arises only when "formal" adultery has been committed. However, I am unable to find the correct application of this idea in the case under my notice. Would you kindly explain the matter.

PASTOR.

REPLY.

Dispensation from mixed religion—Guarantees.

To obtain a dispensation from mixed religion with a view to convalidating this union, the customary guarantees must be given by both parties. In regard to the upbringing of the offspring, promises are required only in regard to any future children who may be born of the union. However, although per se promises are not required in regard to the children already born prior to the rectification of the marriage, the parties should be advised in suitable terms of their obligations under Divine Law to see to the Catholic education of these children as well. Every effort should be made to arrange for an immediate response to this advice. However, if the non-Catholic party refuses to agree, or if

practical difficulties arising from the age of the children prevent the realisation of this plan, the dispensation will be granted notwithstanding. This matter has been the subject of a reply of the Holy Office issued in 1942 by way of providing a correct interpretation of the words "de universa prole" of Canon 1061, paragraph 1, concerning the guarantees required for granting a dispensation from mixed religion. This reply has been discussed at greater length in a recent issue of the *A.C. Record* (July, 1952).

Impediment of Crime and Non-Catholics.

Canon 1075—"Those cannot validly contract marriage who during the existence of the same lawful marriage have consummated adultery together and... have attempted marriage even by a mere civil act".

The fact that the two parties to the marriage are Protestants does not mean that the impediment would not arise. All validly baptised persons, including heretics and schismatics, are subject to the laws of the Church, unless they are exempted expressly as in the Canons concerning the canonical form (Canon 1099), or disparity of worship (Canon 1070). Therefore, assuming that these present partners are baptised Protestants, it must be concluded that if the conditions are verified from which arise the impediment of crime, they are prevented from contracting a valid marriage and a dispensation must be obtained before their Union can be convalidated.

Impediment of Crime and Ignorance.

Neither would their ignorance of the contents of Canon 1075 cause the impediment not to arise. The governing principle in this matter is enunciated in Canon 16, paragraph 1: "In the case of invalidating or incapacitating laws, no ignorance excuses from them unless the law expressly so states". The reason is that invalidating and inhabilitating laws have as their objective the common good of society and, therefore, they must be upheld in those individual cases in which ignorance of the law is even quite inculpable.

True enough some older Canonists considered the impediment of crime to be established by way of a penalty for those involved in a guilty association and admitted that ignorance of the law could prevent the impediment from arising, applying the rules by which ignorance excuses from canonical penalties. However, this reasoning could not be sustained now in view of the clear principle of Canon 16, paragraph 1. Further, if this impediment were to be considered as a canonical penalty it should find some place in the relevant parts of the fifth book of the

Code concerning penalties and delicts. However, no mention of it is to be found in this part of the Code.

Impediment of Crime and Formal Adultery.

Adultery in this case is "formal" when both parties act with sure knowledge of one and the same marriage bond. In the present case both parties had sure knowledge of the husband's previous bond, even though they were ignorant of the canonical implications of their behaviour. The adultery would not be formal if, for instance, the former partner were believed to be dead, but, in fact, was alive. In such a case the accomplices acted without sure knowledge of the same existing bond. Likewise if the married party had concealed the fact of his marriage so that the other party was unaware of the existing bond, the adultery would not be "formal" in the sense required by the law of Canon 1075. The impediment is designed to prevent offences against an existing marriage bond. Therefore, it affects only those who are aware of the existence of the bond.

*

*

*

*

PAULINE PRIVILEGE AND DIVORCED CONVERTS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

When a convert from any of the Protestant churches is received into the Church it is customary nowadays to baptise him conditionally, even though it can be established that he received Baptism in some Protestant sect. Now in view of this widespread doubt as to the validity of Protestant baptisms, I have fell to wondering why the Pauline Privilege is not available more often with a view to enabling a divorced convert to be remarried to a Catholic person. For instance, let us suppose that Thomas, a divorced Protestant, is received into the Church and is baptised conditionally, it will be found that his former spouse was not baptised at all, or was baptised in some Protestant sect so that the validity of her baptism also may be doubted. Why cannot Thomas use the Pauline Privilege to remarry in view of the canonical principle that the legal presumption favours the converted party?

PRESBYTER.

REPLY.

In considering the validity or nullity of a marriage, the basic canonical principle is that enunciated in Canon 1014: "Marriage enjoys the favour of the law. Hence, in doubt, the validity of marriage is to be upheld until the contrary is proved, except as provided in Canon 1127". The exception contained in Canon 1127 concerns a converted party: "In

doubt the privilege of the faith enjoys the favour of the law". If a marriage was contracted by two unbaptised persons, and there is the question of applying the Pauline Privilege in favour of one of these parties who has been converted, doubts which are practically insoluble are resolved in favour of the convert, e.g., doubts concerning the sincerity of the reply to the interpolations, or the sufficiency of reasons for dispensing from the interpellations, or, in general, the existence of any conditions requisite for the use of the Pauline Privilege. However, when the insoluble doubt concerns the baptism of one or both of the parties, a reply of the Holy Office issued in 1937 must be our guide.

It may happen that both parties are doubtfully baptised. Prior to the reply referred to, most authorities would not allow the application of Canon 1127 in such a case; for, if both baptisms should be valid in fact, the marriage is *ratum* and, assuming that it had been consummated, it would be absolutely indissoluble. Therefore, the Church would not take the risk of appearing to dissolve such a marriage. This interpretation has been enforced by the reply of the Holy Office. When it could be established that one party to a marriage was unbaptised, while an insoluble doubt remained as to the baptism of the other party, authors commonly granted that the doubt should be solved in favour of the convert by presuming that the doubtfully baptised person was in fact unbaptised. The reply of the Holy Office has not contradicted this interpretation but has withdrawn such cases from the Ordinaries and reserved them to the Holy Office.

- "1. Whether, in a marriage contracted by two non-Catholics who are doubtfully baptised, in case of an insoluble doubt regarding baptism, either party upon conversion to the faith may be allowed the use of the Pauline Privilege in virtue of Canon 1127 of the Code of Canon Law.
2. Whether, in a marriage contracted between a party who is not baptised and a non-Catholic party who is doubtfully baptised, in case of insoluble doubt regarding baptism, the Ordinaries can allow to either party upon conversion to the faith the use of the Pauline Privilege in virtue of Canon 1127".

Reply.

- "1. In the negative.
2. Recourse must be had to Holy Office in each case".

SUMMARY PROCESS FOR NULLITY OF BIGAMOUS MARRIAGE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Will you kindly guide me in regard to this case.

John and Mary were married in the Church, and after a few years of married life their quarrels led to a separation. In the meantime Mary became involved with a certain William and they lived together as husband and wife for some time. Mary discovered by some odd chance that her supposed husband had concealed a previous marriage, so that their union was in fact bigamous. Police action followed and John was convicted of bigamy in the Criminal Court.

William and Mary wish to be married now in the Church. Will the conviction of John in the Civil Court be sufficient to establish Mary's freedom to marry. Also, what dispensation must be obtained, for example, from the impediment of crime.

L.B.P.

REPLY.

Impediment of Crime.

It follows as a conclusion from the discussion set forth in the preceding query that the impediment of crime does not arise in this case, even though there might have been a mutual promise of marriage between William and Mary. Canon 1075, paragraph 1: "Those cannot validly contract marriage who, during the existence of the same lawful marriage, have consummated adultery together and have mutually promised each other to marry". If there was no real bond of marriage in existence when the adultery took place, the impediment could not arise, despite the bad faith of the parties concerned.

Summary Process of Nullity of Marriage.

It will be necessary that Mary's canonical freedom to marry be established by medium of the summary process described in Canons 1990-1992.

"Even though the former marriage be invalid or dissolved for any reason, it is not therefore allowed to contract another until the nullity or dissolution of the former shall have been established according to law and with certainty". (Canon 1069, par. 2). No doubt the existence of the previous bond will be established by a "certain and authentic document", so that the summary procedure of Canon 1990 may be employed. This entails the citation of the parties and the intervention of the Defender of the Bond, the decision being given by the Ordinary.

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

ALTAR WINE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

When saying Mass at a Religious Institution, I noticed that the wine tasted quite different from the wine I had been using on previous mornings. On making enquiries I learned that the new brand was supplied by a Catholic layman, who said that this particular brand was suitable for Mass, but he added that he would obtain official approbation for it. Nothing further was heard. I did not continue using that wine, for it was not a brand approved by the Bishop. Would you please comment on:—

- i. The validity of the Mass celebrated with that particular wine;
- ii. The obligation on the Celebrant to ensure that proper wine is supplied by the Institution in which he must say Mass;
- iii. The brands of wines approved for use in this country?

CELEBRANS.

REPLY.

The Code of Canon Law states that the wine must be natural wine from the fruit of the vine and incorrupt (Canon 815, § 2). The IV Plenary Council decreed that local Ordinaries must take care that pure wine is used for the celebration of Mass, and if necessary, they shall nominate reliable vintners from whom it may be purchased. (Decree 351). The Rubrics of the Missal also discuss some of the defects that may occur in the wine (De defectibus, iv, 1-2). If the wine has become vinegar, or is wholly corrupted or adulterated, it is invalid matter for Mass. If, however, the wine has begun to sour, or is not properly fermented, or is not pure, then it is valid matter but unlawful, and consequently it is gravely sinful to use it. The Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, in an Instruction of 26th March, 1929, reminded priests of the grave obligation that obliges them to ensure that both the bread and wine are valid and lawful matter for the Holy Sacrifice. They should purchase the flour and wine only from such persons whose integrity gives complete assurance regarding the purity of their products (cfr. *A.A.S.*, xxi (1929), pp. 634-635).

The above queries may be answered as follows:—

1. The validity of the Mass will obviously depend upon the purity of the wine in question. The difference in taste is not in itself sufficient reason for doubting the purity of the wine, as the taste of wine depends

upon the variety of grapes used and upon other factors in the wine-making process. We might refer our correspondent to a discussion of this process in the *A.C.R.* xviii (1941), pp. 200-206.

2. The Celebrant has a grave obligation to make sure that the wine he uses is suitable matter for the Sacrifice. If, as is true of many dioceses, the Local Ordinary has issued a list of approved brands of altar-wine, the priest may reasonably presume that there is no need for further enquiry, unless, of course, in some particular instance he may be doubtful of the validity of the wine offered him. The Celebrant, too, has the right and duty to insist that any instructions, regarding the brands of wine to be used at Mass, given by the Local Ordinary be complied with.

3. CELEBRANTS must consult his Local Ordinary to ascertain what brands of wine have been approved, as the list varies from diocese to diocese, according to the brands of wine available.

*

*

*

*

BLESSING OF BAPTISMAL FONT ON THE VIGIL OF PENTECOST.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I should be grateful if you would discuss through the pages of your *Record* the following:

Is a Parish Priest bound to have in his parochial church, where there is a Baptismal Font, the full ceremony of the Vigil of Pentecost, i.e., is he bound to say the Lessons, and prayers in the Missal and afterwards recite the Litanies? Some think he is exempt by privilege.

WESTERN PRIEST.

REPLY.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites has several times reaffirmed the obligation of Parish Priests to bless the Baptismal Font in their parochial churches both on Holy Saturday and on the vigil of Pentecost. The Congregation has declared that even an immemorial custom of blessing the Font only on Holy Saturday must be abolished as an abuse and contrary to the Rubrics (DD. 2878, 3331, 3776). This same legislation is repeated by the IV Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand when it lays down that Parish Priests are bound to bless solemnly the Baptismal Font twice in the year, namely on Holy Saturday and on the vigil of Pentecost, according to the formula of the Missal (Decree 323). There can be no question, therefore, of privilege dispensing from this obligation.

If, however, the new Rite of the restored vigil of Easter is observed in the church on Holy Saturday night, the Lessons, the blessing of the Baptismal Water and the Litanies may be omitted on the vigil of Pentecost, and the Mass is begun with the Introit, as given in the Missal for private Masses. This order may be followed even though the Mass is a conventual, solemn or sung Mass (*Ordo Sabbati Sancti*, Ordinationes, iv, 12).

*

*

*

*

RENEWAL OF THE BENEDICTION HOST.

Dear Rev. Sir,

We receive our supply of altar breads every fortnight. The question arises as to whether we should renew the Benediction Host every week even though the new breads may not be available, or is it sufficient to renew It every fortnight?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

The IV Plenary Council states that the Eucharistic Particles should be renewed frequently, namely every week as a general rule. The renewal should never be deferred for more than a fortnight. Care, too, should be taken that the particles to be consecrated have been made recently (Decree 393). It is necessary, then, to renew the Host each week. Although the newly consecrated Host may have been made at the same time, nevertheless by renewing It weekly one can be certain that It is in good condition.

*

*

*

*

MISSA PRIVATA.

Dear Rev. Sir,

What is the meaning of the term 'private Mass'?

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

The term 'private Mass' is used in the Rubrics in several different senses. In some instances it is applied to a Mass, which is not a conventual Mass, i.e., celebrated as part of the obligation of the daily Office in choir (cfr. *Rub. gen.* iv, 3). 'Private Mass' serves also to distinguish a Low Mass from a High Mass or a sung Mass (cfr. *Rub. gen.* xvi); in this case it may include a Low Mass, which is a conventual Mass. Furthermore, it signifies a Low Mass that is not a conventual Mass (cfr. *Rub. gen.* vii, i).

On certain days, e.g., 6th August, 8th and 15th September, a second prayer is prescribed 'in Missis privatis tantum'. The term is here used in the third sense given above, and consequently the commemoration would be omitted in a conventual Mass, a High Mass or a *Missa cantata* without Deacon and Subdeacon (cfr. S.R..C. 2572, 4).

* * * *

ADDITION TO THE DIVINE PRAISES.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites, by decree of 23rd December, 1952, declared that His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in response to many petitions, had approved the addition to the Divine Praises of the invocation: 'Blessed be her glorious Assumption'. The original Decree directed the addition to be made after the invocation: 'Blessed be the name of Mary, Virgin and Mother'; however, according to a correction made later, the new invocation is to be added after: 'Blessed be her holy and Immaculate Conception' (*A.A.S.* xiv (1953), p. 194 and *ibid.* p. 251).

The Divine Praises owe their origin to the zeal of an Italian Jesuit, Father Aloysius Felici (1736-1818), who introduced them in a confraternity for Sailors, as a means of eradicating the vice of blasphemy. The practice of reciting these Praises spread to other confraternities. Pope Pius IX gave them His special commendation during the celebration of the octave of the Epiphany in the church of S. Andrea della Valle in the year 1847. Some days later an instruction was issued prescribing the recitation of the Divine Praises after Mass and during Benediction. At first this applied only to Rome, but the practice was gradually adopted throughout the whole of Italy. Succeeding Popes enriched the pious exercise with Indulgences. The invocations were originally eight in number, but four more have since been added: 'Blessed be her holy and Immaculate Conception' by Pope Pius IX in 1854, after the definition of the dogma; 'Blessed be His most Sacred Heart' by Pope Leo XIII in 1897; 'Blessed be Saint Joseph, her most chaste Spouse' by Pope Benedict XV in 1921.

* * * *

NEW EDITIONS OF THE ROMAN RITUAL AND THE ROMAN MISSAL.

A new 'Editio typica' of the Roman Ritual was published by the Holy See on the 25th January, 1952. The last 'typical' edition was in 1925. The principal change is in the rearrangement of the contents, and many of the Blessings hitherto found in the Appendix have now been incorporated in Titulus IX (formerly VIII). Alterations have been

made to several of the rubrics to bring them in line with decrees issued since the last edition, e.g., the use of saliva in the administration of Baptism, the distribution of Communion to several persons in different rooms of the same house. The Sacrament of Confirmation is treated in Titulus III. The first chapter contains the dispositions of the decree of 1946 regarding the administration of Confirmation to those in danger of death. The second chapter gives the rite to be observed in administering the sacrament in accord with the above decree, while the third chapter gives the rite to be followed by a priest who, in virtue of an Apostolic Indult, administers the Sacrament to those who are not in the danger of death. This last rite was previously contained in the Appendix. Another feature of the new edition is that the Psalms, where it is question of a complete Psalm, are given in the new version approved in 1945.

The *Ephemerides liturgicae* (lxvii (1953), pp. 46-61) gives a lengthy review of the 'Editio sexta post typicam' of the Roman Missal recently published by the Libreria Editrice Vaticana. The new edition was prepared by a commission consisting of the staff of the above review, together with other experts in liturgical studies. A concerted effort has been made to combine practical considerations of convenience and artistic distinction in the use of ornament and type. The new edition, however, remains essentially the same as the previous edition.

In the prayers of preparation before Mass, the title: 'Oratio S. Ambrosii Episcopi' now simply reads: "Oratio sacerdotis ante Missam". The researches of Dom Morin and Dom Wilmart have established that the prayer must be attributed not to St. Ambrose but to a certain monk John de Fécamp, who lived in the 11th century. Seemingly the prayer was introduced into the Missal by John Burchard (+1506) but the text was defective and a number of textual corrections have been made in the present edition. Similarly, in the prayers of the thanksgiving after Mass some changes have been made in the titles of authorship. St. Bonaventure no longer appears as the composer of the prayer: 'Transfige, dulcissime Domine Jesu'. This prayer is found in a work: 'Stimulus amoris' of John of Milan, O.F.M. The name of St. Ignatius has been omitted from the title of the *Anima Christi*. The Saint made use of the prayer in his Spiritual Exercises and he was responsible for its wide diffusion, with the result that he came to be regarded as the author of the prayer. Manuscript and historical evidence is in favour

of its 14th century origin. It has been variously attributed to St. Thomas Aquinas, Pope John XXII (1314-1334) or to some unknown writer between the time of St. Thomas and St. Ignatius.

P. L. MURPHY.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST, by Thomas a Kempis. Translated by Abbot Justin McCann, O.S.B., London. Burns Oates, 1952. 262 pp. 8/6.

Abbot McCann has done all a great favour in making a new translation of the immortal book which brings to us the Catholic piety of the Middle Ages. He has translated the Latin into lucid, modern English, while retaining all the dignity and reticence of the original. Many will be interested, too, in the short account he gives in the preface of the life of the writer. Thomas a Kempis was born at Kempen, near Dusseldorf, in 1379 or 1380. Coming as a boy to the Low Countries, he was educated by the Brothers of the common life, that splendid body of priests and laymen founded by Gerard Groot. Thomas eventually joined them in 1408. He lived quietly in the Flemish backwater while the glittering century engaged in its tumults and turmoils. He died in 1471 at the age of 92. Such is the traditional account, and it is not the place to consider the questions raised by Pierre Debongnie, the well-known Belgian Redemptorist critic. Its the book that matters! And from that wonderful century has any little work so strenuously refused to die as the *Imitation of Christ*, which was written long before Luther was born, and long, too, before the Council of Trent? So the Catholics of the Middle Ages knew how to pray, and they also knew Christ. If there is anyone among us who has not read this classic, this new edition will entice them. The publishers promise in the near future to print an edition at the small price of 6/-. A Protestant historian has recently written that the Roman religion has given the world this admirable work, the *Imitation of Christ*, which ranks immediately after the Gospels. *Fas est ab hoste doceri.*

T.V.

Homiletics

THE ASSUMPTION.

The feast of the glorious Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary holds pride of place among the feasts of our heavenly Mother that the Church celebrates in the course of each year. For centuries the observance of this feast has expressed the belief of the Church that the Immaculate Mother of God, at the close of her earthly life, was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory. It is this belief that the infallible voice of the Vicar of Christ has declared to be a truth revealed by God.

‘Thou are all fair, and the stain of original sin is not found in thee’ sings the Church in praise of Mary. From the moment of her conception Mary was preserved free from all taint of sin. Not for an instant did the Spirit of Evil and Deception hold sway over her soul. The Mother of Christ, she was most intimately united to her Son in His victorious struggle against the Devil. She is the New Eve whom God foretold would crush the head of the serpent beneath her heel. Addressing the Devil after he had brought about the downfall of Adam and Eve, God said to him: “I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel”. For this purpose Christ came into the world, that He might loosen the bonds that bound all men after the sin of our first parents. ‘By one man sin entered into this world and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men’ wrote St. Paul to the christians of Rome. Our divine Saviour, Jesus Christ, by the merits of His passion and death overcame sin and death, and delivered men from the power of the devil. All men have been united to Christ in Baptism, made one with Him, all have become sharers in His victory over sin: ‘As in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive’. God has ordained that men shall not participate in the fulness of the glory of Christ’s victory until their bodies shall rise glorious and immortal on the Last Day. But it has pleased God to make one exception to that decree—Mary, the Immaculate Mother of our Saviour. Unlike the rest of men, Our Lady was free from all sin and free from the consequences of sin. It was fitting, therefore, that God should have anticipated, in her instance, the day of the general resurrection and should have re-united her soul and body and taken them to heavenly glory at the close of her life on this earth. In this way, Mary shares

more fully in the victory of Christ over the devil; more effectively does she crush the head of the serpent beneath her heel. The Resurrection of Christ was an essential part of Christ's victory over sin and death, so, too, the glorious Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary was the compliment of her part in that struggle.

Mary is the mother of Christ, the mother of the Divine Redeemer of the human race. Through her Christ came into the world. 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done to me according to thy word' was the way in which Mary expressed her submission to the divine Will, and her acceptance of the role God had allotted to her in His plan for the salvation of mankind. For a moment the accomplishment of the divine plan depended upon Mary's consent. Mary became the mother of God, and on the first Christmas night her child, the Saviour of the world, was born in Bethlehem. With all the tenderness of a mother's love, Mary cared for her divine child during the days of His infancy and childhood. Who shall measure the perfection of the love of Mary for her divine child or the love of the child for His mother? The days of the hidden life at Nazareth completed, it was at Mary's request that Jesus performed His first public miracle, when He changed water into wine at the wedding feast in Cana. Throughout the years of the public ministry, the Gospels mention only twice the name of Mary, but it is not too much to presume that her prayers brought many to hear and believe the message of her divine Son. When the time came that the Son of man must suffer and be rejected by the ancients and the scribes, and be put to death, Mary was united with her Son in His sacrifice upon Calvary. St. John says simply: 'There stood by the Cross of Jesus, his mother'. Such was the union of Mary with her divine Son throughout His life on this earth. It is well nigh impossible to imagine that after her life on earth, Mary should have been united to her Son, in heaven, in soul, though separated in body. Shall we presume to say that our Divine Redeemer hesitated to bestow upon His mother this singular privilege of re-uniting her soul to her glorious body, when He could so easily have done so. St. Francis de Sales reminds us that God has commanded us to love and honour our parents, and there can be no doubt that our divine Lord would have fulfilled that command in a most perfect manner. If, then, continues the Saint, He could have so honoured His Mother by taking her both in soul and body to the glory of heaven, we may be certain that He did so.

The eminent sanctity of Our Lady gives us further assurance of

her Assumption. The angel Gabriel greeted Mary: 'Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women'. Mary's freedom from all stain of sin was not simply a negative quality, she was free from sin, but at the same time she was 'full of grace', with a fulness unsurpassed by any other creature. We marvel at the high degree of perfection to which many of the Saints attained, but Mary surpasses all these. The great apostle of the Gentiles, St. Paul, was a vessel of election, the soul of Mary was an inexhaustible abyss of all graces and virtues. She was the temple of the Holy Ghost *par excellence*. In no heart did the flame of divine charity burn more ardently than in the heart of Mary. No human life manifested a more perfect imitation of the life of Christ our divine Model, than the life of Mary. Could it be that God would permit the body of the mother of His divine Son to fall into the corruption of the tomb as befalls the bodies of other men? The piety of the universal church, down through the centuries, has most certainly expressed the divinely revealed truth that at the close of her life on earth God took up to heavenly glory the body of the Immaculate Virgin Mary.

As we profess our belief in the Assumption of our heavenly Mother, let us likewise strengthen our hope that, with the assistance of God's grace, we, too, may be sharers in this glory. The Assumption of our Lady is a pledge for us of the efficacy of the Redemption Christ purchased by His blood. The fullness of Christ's victory over sin and death will one day be ours, if we remain faithful to Him and to His commands. Let us make our own the petition of the Church in the Mass of the Assumption, that through Mary's intercession we may ever keep our gaze fixed on heavenly things and so merit to become sharers in the glory of Mary. Then shall we see the Queen of Heaven 'clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars'.

P. L. MURPHY.

*

*

*

*

Notes

The occasion of this Note is the receipt of the Appendix to the "Theologia Moralis" in the series produced at the Pontifical Lateran Atheneum. (De Castitate et Luxuria. Antonius Lanza, Petrus Palazzini. pp. 318. Marietti, Rome, 1952.) Since THE VIRTUE OF CHASTITY this work is meant chiefly as a handbook for students attending lectures, one would expect clarity and general completeness; and these two qualities are in evidence. While an attitude of respect towards the sacred function of generation is maintained, this does not prevent a plain statement of what the virtue of Chastity demands whether in the married state or for those who are unmarried. The sins against the virtue are explained for the benefit of future confessors, and special Questions: Impotence, Sterilization and Artificial Insemination, and the moral aspects of certain acts of interference with the unborn child, are discussed with moderation. When a matter is still disputed among Theologians, the authors leave no doubt as to what is their own opinion, but allow the probability of what is taught by others and supported by arguments. An instance is the morality of the co-operation of a husband by conjugal relations with his wife who has inserted a pessary. Their conclusion is: *ergo dicta occlusio vaginae impedit, quominus actus generativus exerceatur, etc.*, but they add: *in praxi, donec responsum authenticum venerit, alia sententia potest admitti.* (p. 125). The work can be recommended to Priests, both young and old, as a sane and reasoned presentation of the obligations arising from the virtue of Chastity.

Of recent years, so much has been written and spoken, with presumably the best of intentions, on the meaning and practice of this necessary virtue, that—as often happens when over-emphasis is placed on a particular subject—the main issue tends to become confused. It may be of profit, therefore, to state briefly the nature of the Virtue of Chastity, and by implication of its opposite Vice, Impurity.

St. Thomas (S.T. 2 a, 2 ae, Q. CLI, art. 1) accepts the derivation of the term 'chastity' from *castigare*, to chastise, and so bring under control. It is a virtue, because it restrains and modifies according to the dictates of right reason, a human concupiscence; the concupiscence in question being the desire for sexual satisfaction. It is a moral Virtue,

a part of the cardinal Virtue of Temperance, directing man to the right use of the sexual faculty, and to the proper and reasonable enjoyment of sexual satisfaction.

The sexual faculty was given to man by the Creator for the purpose of propagating the human race. "Male and female he created them. And God blessed them, saying: Increase and multiply and fill the earth". (Gen. 1/27-8.) For the proper and fitting multiplication of the human race, God instituted the state of Matrimony. "A man shall...cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh". (Ibid. 2/24.) Outside the married state, the sexual faculty may not be used at all. It is against the natural law in its *secondary* precepts to bring children into the world except in wedlock, for it militates against their education and the fitting propagation of the race. The use of the sexual faculty in any such way that its natural purpose, the conception of children, is deliberately rendered impossible, is a violation of the very *primary* precepts of the law of nature. Between husband and wife, the sexual faculty may be used lawfully: such use is according to the divine plan, it peoples the earth, provides the remedy for the concupiscence of the flesh and fosters the love between husband and wife which is required for their common mode of life. The virtue which helps to abstinence from all sexual acts by those who are not married, and to the proper use of the same faculty in the state of matrimony, is Chastity. In the one case, it is perfect Chastity, temporary or perpetual, according as the person intends in due course to marry or to remain celibate; and in the other case, it is conjugal chastity.

In his wisdom, the Creator placed in man, as in the irrational animals, a strong inclination to exercise the faculties which are indispensable for his preservation as an individual and as a species. Without the desire to eat and drink, a person would most likely neglect these important and necessary functions, and in consequence would soon perish of hunger and weakness. Unless there were an inclination to sexual acts, the human race would cease in a brief space. The desire for food and drink, which springs from nature's first law of self-preservation, is commonly so strong that the labour of gaining them is not considered excessive, although it frequently absorbs the greater portion of one's time and energies. In like manner, the desire for sexual acts is sufficient to outweigh the inconveniences which reason tells will follow,

the tremendous and responsible task of rearing the children who may be conceived of the union.

Every faculty finds satisfaction in the acquisition of its object. This is true of the spiritual faculties, the intellect and the will, which are destined to find their full enjoyment only in the vision of infinite Truth and perfect Goodness; it holds for the five senses, as experience teaches; it is none-the-less verified in the case of the faculties of preservation. Thus we speak of spiritual joy and gladness, of sensible gratification, of the enjoyment of a good meal, of sexual pleasure. The satisfaction experienced by the exercise of the bodily faculties is found chiefly in the organs of the particular function, but brings with it also a general sense of well-being to the whole body.

The exercise of the faculty of generation is accompanied by a feeling of pleasure which is called sexual: in the theological text books it is named *delectatio venerea*. Though it may be aroused by the sense of touch, it is distinct from it, and exists only when the organs are in the state which leads up to or accompanies the climax of the sexual act, the seminal emission. The two things, the activity of the sexual faculty and the sensation of pleasure are linked together by a natural relationship. Only when the person concerned has a right to perform the sexual act, is he (or she) entitled to the enjoyment and satisfaction that accompanies it. *Delectatio propter actum*. The exercise of conjugal rights—and outside the married state sexual acts are gravely unlawful—merely for the sake of pleasure, is an inordinate use of things good in themselves, and a venial sin.

The activity of the sexual faculty directly brought about, except in the performance of marriage duties, is admittedly a grave sin, but we may pause to ask: In what precisely is the violation of the moral law? Is it in the unlawful performance of a physical act, or in the enjoyment of forbidden pleasure? Where there is voluntary sexual excitement, the experience of the venereal pleasure is also voluntary, for, by reason of natural concomitance, the two cannot be separated. It is useless, for example, for a man who commits adultery to protest that he found no satisfaction in it. If we say that he sinned by enjoying unlawful pleasure, we presuppose that the act from which the pleasure ensued was unlawful. Fundamentally, therefore, he would seem to sin by the act of adulterous intercourse, which is a use of the sexual faculty violating

the (secondary) precepts of the natural law. (The additional malice of injustice in adultery is beside the point at the moment.) Similarly, the man who deliberately commits an act of self-abuse perverts the proper function and use of the faculty and violates the primary precepts of the natural law: and here is the act of immorality. He also finds gratification in the act—it is impossible for him not to do so—and as the act was voluntary, so also is the pleasure which of natural necessity accompanies it. On the other hand, the deliberate acceptance of the pleasure associated with involuntary sexual movements implies their subsequent approval by the will.

Because the craving for this pleasure is so insistent in our animal nature, being kept in check only by the constant exercise of the will, what is apt to come to mind at the mention of a violation of chastity is the thought of the gratification which proceeds from the use of the faculties of generation. The wrongful enjoyment of sexual pleasure is thus often regarded as synonymous with sexual sin; and indeed, the desire for such enjoyment is normally the reason for acts of impurity. If the craving be resisted, the unlawful acts which are done to satisfy it will not be committed, and the sixth commandment will be observed. Chastity restrains the concupiscence of the flesh, it directs the right use of the sexual faculty forbidding it for those not joined in wedlock; and moderates or governs the enjoyment of sexual pleasure in the circumstances when the act is lawful, i.e., in the married state. In applying a break to the concupiscence of the flesh, chastity perfects the person whose soul it adorns: he has the habit of denying himself forbidden pleasures which spring from indulgence in sexuality, and thus he avoids these acts and the violation of the natural law as implied in the Commandment: "Thou shalt not commit adultery". It is thus a true virtue, a good quality of the soul whereby a man lives in goodness, avoiding the excesses to which nature is prone: no man can use it for evil, for its tendency is always to good.

The activity of the sexual organs may, for one reason or another, never reach its completion, which is the emission of the seminal fluid or the vaginal secretion: it may be confined to the initial or intermediate stages, which are known as carnal disturbances, *motus carnales*. With the complete act is associated full satisfaction, and if the act does not come to its term, the delectation or pleasure is referred to as incomplete.

• •

The latter, however, is the beginning of the former towards which it has an intrinsic tendency. Therefore, outside marriage, acts of sexuality, if voluntary, are sinful, whether complete or incomplete. Both are an unlawful use of the faculty of procreation, and imply the enjoyment of forbidden pleasure: in either case the fault is serious. Such is the commonly accepted teaching, which it would be rash to question. Between the incomplete and the complete act, however, there is this difference, that while the act is still incomplete it is possible intrinsically to order it to its natural purpose, the proper procreation of children: if the act be complete this end is beyond attainment.

What is to be said of the morality of involuntary carnal movements or rebellion of the flesh? If they are involuntary, they are neither good nor bad: they are not human acts and so have no morality. The same is true of the sensation of pleasure which accompanies them. *Consensus non sensus facit peccatum*. It is possible for the will to give subsequent consent to what it did not cause, and in this hypothesis they would become sinful. Because of the proclivity of fallen human nature to yield to the attractions of the flesh, there is some obligation to resist them, if they are considerable, an obligation which varies with the intensity of the excitement and the temperament of the individual.

Can carnal excitements which are aroused as the result of a person's own actions be called involuntary? If they are not in any way foreseen, they are not voluntary—*nil volitum nisi prius cognitum*. Can they be foreseen and still be involuntary? According to the principle of the double effect, they can be so. If the act which is the cause of the carnal disturbance is good in itself, or at least indifferent in the matter of chastity, if the intention of the agent, as is supposed, is a lawful one, and if there be a proportionate cause for permitting the resultant carnal rebellion, then the person may have no worry. There are certain acts which have a tendency to provoke the sexual passions: these are called acts of immodesty. They are in themselves indifferent, but because of the danger of seminal emission and of consent of the will to the accompanying pleasure, a real reason is required to justify them. The gravity of the reason will depend on the natural association of the action in question and the arousing of sexual activity, and also on the strength or weakness of the will of the person concerned. These acts may be considered as an occasion of sin, and their morality judged according to the rules given for avoiding sinful occasions.

JAMES MADDEN.

There is another centenary this year—Constantinople's (and New York's) year—which deserves a passing note. Rabelais died four hundred years ago (April 9, 1553. The date is traditional.) Now you may ask, gentle reader, why drag Rabelais into these austere pages? First, let us sketch the *curriculum vitae* of one whose name has survived, and is used frequently in English, Rabelaisian humour, for instance. Francois Rabelais was born near Chinon, his father being engaged in the law. The family home years later became an inn, thus giving rise to the legend of Rabelais, the poet of wine and good cheer, being born in the far more satisfactory setting of an inn. Very little is known of his youth, but in 1520 we find him a Franciscan. He was a son of the Renaissance, enamoured of the new learning, and in correspondence with one of the great men of the party, Budé. In 1524, he passed from the Franciscans to the Benedictines, becoming secretary to the abbot, who was, also, a bishop. This meant journeys; the sharp eyed secretary drank in impressions with the avidity of the born satirist and novelist. Rabelais is a link between the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Looking at the pictures of the Flemish painters of the XV century and early XVI century, one is struck by the calm naturalness of their work, the sanity, absolute cleanness and deep religious sense of a Van Eyck, a Van der Weyden, or, a Dirk Bouts. It is disconcerting, then, to contemplate Rabelais, who, coming from a similar milieu, had hardly the qualities of mind of the Flemish Primitives. The good Brueghel would have been far more Rabelais's cup of wine! In 1527, he threw off his monastic habit; he began to wander all over France, in the dress of a secular priest. Already he was attracted to the profession of medicine, studying at Montpellier in 1530, aged 35 years. After a short course, he graduated and practised medicine with success at Lyons.¹ Curiously enough, up to this, although reading the Greek and Latin authors with avidity, the demon of writing had not taken possession of this born writer. His literary career opened quietly, with the publication of medical works, for instance, the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates; once, however, his pen had been dipped in ink, he seems to have written continuously. After a series of medical works, all written in 1531, suddenly in 1532 he published the *Horrible and Wonderful Actions and Deeds of the renowned Pantagruel, King of the*

¹As Bachelor of Medicine. He returned, later, to Montpellier, where he graduated doctor of medicine in 1537. Rabelais had a reputation as an anatomist.

*Dypsodes, son of the great giant Gargantua, lately composed by Master Alcofribas Nasier, Abstractor of the Quintessence.*² At once, the Sorbonne condemned the book; the author, however, had left for Rome as medical adviser to a typical Renaissance bishop, Jean du Bellay, bishop of Paris and diplomat, later cardinal, who always showed a fatherly interest in his wayward doctor.³ Rabelais was in the following years often in Rome with his patron, dispensing medical advice, telling his curious stories to bland curialists, and, no doubt, having them capped by the same bland gentlemen of Rome. He also did a little private, ecclesiastical business; Paul III kindly lifted from him the excommunication he had incurred. He was to be welcomed back to any Benedictine house he chose. Naturally he fixed upon an abbey, whose abbot was none other than his great friend, the debonair Du Bellay! He was publishing his extraordinary book during these years, adding further adventures, sometimes quite forgetting his principal characters, to devote himself to his wonderful minor character, Panurge, who is a French Sam Weller, but a Sam who had lived with Renaissance monks and knew all the nasty stories of the Middle Ages! The monastic walls had not been built which could contain Rabelais. His indulgent abbot, Du Bellay, allowed him to wander, naming him towards the end Curé of Meudon, an office that Rabelais never exercised, and soon resigned, although the name has clung to him. Having seen his *Fourth Book* of the adventures through the press, Francois Rabelais, ex-Franciscan, ex-Benedictine, then Benedictine again, priest, doctor of medicine and writer, passed to his eternal reward on April 9, 1553.⁴

To read Rabelais's life is to get a startling 'close-up' of, apart from his literary renown, an obscure religious and his ideas at the time of the Council of Trent. It is revealing and instructive. The cheerful impudence of such men, hiding nothing, wasting no time in laments, but taking everything in their stride, and ending up in a snug tomb under the floor of some church, as pious as can be, is an eye-opener for the

²Alcofribas Nasier is an anagram for Francois Rabelais.

³Du Bellay (1492-1560) was a man of great distinction. He became bishop of Paris in 1532 and was created Cardinal in 1535. He had been French ambassador at London during the crucial years 1527-1529, leaving a valuable account of his mission to Henry VIII. He was the uncle of the celebrated poet, Joachim Du Bellay.

⁴Nothing is known of the death of Rabelais. Legend has preserved two versions of his last words: the first, "Ring down the curtain. The comedy has ended"; the second, "I am going to see the great 'Perhaps'."

modern.⁵ And so you see, gentle reader, he is one of us; we are 'stuck' with Rabelais. The long rambling romance of Rabelais celebrates the exploits of Gargantua, a king of a distant mythical kingdom.⁶ Coming to France, Gargantua, who was a giant, frequents the various schools of learning, before coming to Paris, which, of course, gives Rabelais many opportunities to make fun of the theologians of the old school. For example, Gargantua, tired out one day, sat down on Notre-Dame, which was big enough to be a suitable stool for the giant. The bells of the Cathedral attracted his attention, and he took them as a decoration for his gigantic mare's neck. The distracted Parisians, after trying various ways of getting their bells back, sent a Sorbonic doctor, Janotus de Bragmardo, to plead with the giant, and thus he argues:

Hem, hem, gud-day, sirs, gud-day. It were but reason that you should restore to us our bells; for we have great need of them....If you restore them unto us.... Ego occidi unum porcum, et ego habet bonum vinū: but of good wine we cannot make bad latin....Ego sic argumentor. Omnis bella bellabilis in bellerio bellando, bellans bellativo, bellare facit, bellabiliter bellantes. Parisius habet bellas. Ergo gluc, Ha, Ha, Ha....

And so on. Rabelais warms up a bit with the story of the pilgrims from Nantes who wander into the giant's country. They take shelter under a mighty tree for the night. It is but a lettuce which Gargantua collects, with them, to make a salad. The unfortunate pilgrims' adventures in the jaws of the giant, swilled by immense floods of wine, their reflections and their application of the psalms to their condition are highly comic. Pantagruel was a worthy son of Gargantua, even if he did not equal his father's feat of crying in the voice of Stentor: Wine, bring wine! immediately after his birth. Pantagruel began the round of universities that his father had done before, aided by very curious letters of advice from Gargantua. He met at Paris Panurge, who "was of middle stature, not too high nor too low, and had somewhat of an aquiline nose, made like the handle of a razor. He was at that time five and thirty years old...he was a very gallant and proper man of his person, only that he was a little lecherous, and naturally subject to a kind of disease, which at that time they called lack of money,—it is an incomparable grief, yet, notwithstanding, he had threescore and three

⁵"At the present day those who have mistaken their vocation, or who have developed psychological illness or even failed seriously in morals, can in more than one way...find a respectable *modus vivendi*. In the medieval world this was not so...rebels, fugitives...remained then as a kind of running sore...." D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, Cambridge, 1948, pp. 83-4.

⁶Rabelais wrote four books of Pantagruel's adventures, and one of Gargantua's. Gargantua was a stock figure in many of the romances of the period.

tricks to come by it at his need, of which the most honourable and most ordinary was in manner of thieving, secret purloining and filching... otherwise, and in all matters else, the best and most virtuous man in the world". Rabelais could write. His attacks on the scholastics and the learning of his time are now a dead weight in his work; his excessive indulgence in words bore many; his deliberate use of scabrous, crude, disgusting language appal the modern reader. He is redeemed by his humour, his sense of the comic. Rabelais lacked wit; he had the gift of humour. Consider the great storm scene in Book IV of *Pantagruel*. Sailing in unknown seas the merry party pass the islands of Tohu and Bohu. Panurge is delighted to sight a mighty ship "full of Dominicans, Jesuits, Capuchins, Hermits, Augustinians...etc., etc." going to the Council of Chesil "to gabble some new articles of faith against the new heretics". Panurge in his enthusiasm throws Westphalian hams, pots of caviare, Bolonia sausages and other choice things to them, hoping they will remember him in their prayers. Then came the storm, roaring, scudding, howling, whistling, lashing. Panurge endured the pangs of sickness and fear, although calling for pork and beef, because he feels in a short time his motto will be: Eat little and drink the more! In his distress, Panurge amid his groans becomes very religious; he thinks with regret of the plump fathers eating his hams at the Council of Chesil; he calls for his spiritual adviser, the friar Jean des Entommeures, one of Rabelais's richest creations, but the type is now so much out of date that the joke misses its point. The storm has a very different effect on this lusty priest, who curses Panurge by all the devils for his cowardice, much to the distress of the pious Panurge. Rabelais, if fighting a losing battle for modern favour, still has his defenders. Mr. D. B. Wyndham Lewis, for instance, urges that the book was written to make people laugh, and, further, the gross humour has no morbid intent, nor any sign of sniggering, such as are found in the writings of those who emphasise one side of Rabelais exclusively, for example, Balzac and Anatole France in certain of their books. Rabelais, it is urged, is frank and Catholic, a hater of shams, and quite innocent of Puritan prudery. This last we will all grant without argument. He remained a Catholic to the end of the stamp of his master, Erasmus. This peccant religious wrote, on occasions, few indeed, tenderly and superbly of Our Lord and Our Lady. And so he went on to eternity with his sins, his faults of taste, his irreverent treatment of sacred things, his gusts of laughter, his comic genius and his vast creation of outlandish characters

with their outlandish names. Shakespeare and Rabelais, said Chateaubriand have left riches, on which following writers were to write cheques with careless abandon. Francois Rabelais remains a problem, even after four hundred years.⁷

T. VEECH.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE.

The third number of the annual philosophical review from Maynooth, *Philosophical Studies*, has just been published, and the same high standard we noted last year is again in evidence. Here in Australia subscriptions to this review (10/- Aust. currency) may be sent to Rev. J. Challis, Catholic Presbytery, Victoria Park, Perth, W.A.

J.B.

⁷Lucien Febvre has written a most instructive book in his *Le Problème de l'incroyance au XVI siècle : La Religion de Rabelais (L'Evolution de l'Humanité)*. *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* devotes the issue of April 9, 1953, to Rabelais, while the *Times Literary Supplement* (April 10, 1953) has a special article by M. Gustave Cohen, of the Sorbonne.

Book Reviews

A RETREAT: Thirty-three Discourses, With Meditations For the Use of the Clergy, Religious, and Others. By the Rt. Rev. J. C. Hedley, O.S.B. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. London, 1951. (16th edition.)

In the fifty-nine years since Bishop Hedley composed his Retreat it has gained the position of a minor classic among spiritual writings. For all those who have come to know and appreciate it in that period it suffices here to note the appearance of a sixteenth edition. The popularity which has made necessary so many editions of this work has been of a sober, rather than of a spectacular nature, arising from the simple fact that this is a work wonderfully useful for mental prayer. Something of the nature and object of these discourses is described in the preface: "Each of them consists of devout considerations followed by points for mental prayer. The considerations are to be read over slowly and with devotional attention; and the points are to be wrought out with as much fervour of affective acts as may be possible". The author's primary intention in composing these meditations was "to furnish matter for a Retreat of eight or ten days" (Preface). There seems to be enough matter here for a month's Retreat! The more obvious use for this book is in the daily exercise of mental prayer, and it is as such that it has gained such wide esteem.

Among his contemporary Catholic writers, Bishop Hedley has been ranged as second to Newman. However true that may be, he is certainly a master of the English tongue; he commands a style which is restrained and concise; besides—and this is a thing which interests us here—his writing has a certain quality which suits it to the elevated purpose of this work. He makes of prayerful writing a sacred art, for not only is the arrangement of matter admirable, but it is also presented in a manner which makes it "proximate" to prayer. The interposition of short prayers thus comes, not as a break in the continuity of the matter, but as a real complement. From the point of view of solidity we are always given plenty to work on, to pray about, while being continually presented with new points of departure for mental prayer. Each discourse is of about eight pages, and the last criticism that could ever be offered about this book is that there is any lack of solidity or conciseness in any one page.

There are discourses on God, the soul, redemption and grace, sin, death, and judgment. Five discourses are devoted to the Person of Christ, one to our Lady, two to the Holy Spirit. Other subjects considered include the Blessed Sacrament and the Mass, charity towards God and one another, spiritual reading and the divine office, our life and its surroundings, and the virtue of perseverance.

Of course, some discourses are better than others, while to grade each one of them exactly would be a task largely influenced by individual taste. Yet surely it is beyond all doubt that the five discourses on our Lord Jesus Christ are the gems of the whole work. Bishop Hedley does achieve an intense and positive approach to the character of Christ. He not only presents Christ to us as the object "par excellence" of our life of prayer, but he spares no pains to lead us to the closest possible union with Him. The reason he succeeds so well is his wonderful appreciation of the mystery of Christ. It may seem a truism (for us) that we are led to Christ, our Lord and our God, by way of His Sacred Humanity, but since this is the way we are to follow if we are to love God above all things, we must ever be proceeding along it. "To love God above all things...requires some intimate knowledge of God; it requires that God should be in a certain sense seen by our minds; it requires that the feelings, the imagination, and even the senses, should be affected and touched; and it requires that the associations connected with our idea of God should be nearly connected with our own life, our wants, our joys, our sorrows, and our weaknesses. . . . It was to give to us Himself in such a state that He could, as it were, be brought home to our faculties, to our complex human nature, to our feelings, to our hearts, that God was made Man. . . . Ah! my Jesus! In what a profound sense are these words of Thy prophet verified, that there is 'no nation which hath its gods so near as our God is near unto us'. (Deut. IV, 7)". (XI. Christ Our Lord. Pp. 70 & 71.) Thus does the author realise for us the position and meaning of Christ's Humanity in our love of God. Moving on to consider the worship of God, he again seeks the key in the Sacred Humanity. "To worship God is man's essential act; for this he was created. Worship is a mental and intellectual act; the will and the mind must produce it, or it does not exist. But intense, continuous, and hearty worship of God depends greatly upon the heart and feelings. Thus in order to worship God, how much am I assisted by Bethlehem, by Nazareth, by Calvary! . . . Is it not true that my mainstay, my very rock in a desert land, is

the sacred humanity which gives me thoughts, aspirations, and good resolutions?" (XII. Looking Upon Jesus. Pp. 77 & 78.) The Incarnation, in drawing the Humanity into perfect union with the Divinity, supplies us with a wonderful help to intense worship. "What wisest man or most prescient angel could have foreseen that it would have been possible to worship the Infinite God by compassion!" (P. 78.) In every discourse on Christ is this theme the guiding light, but, above all, when he gives us those beautiful pages on "The Sufferings of Christ". Having so wonderfully drawn us to God by giving us the true meaning of the Incarnation, Bishop Hedley sees in Mary our Mother the re-echoing of the Incarnation; her very name "has the special power to present God's loving kindness and the tenderness of the Incarnation in its most effective light". (XXXI. Our Blessed Lady. P. 239.) For the Incarnation will bear "to be re-echoed, to be repeated, to be enforced, to be brought home". (P. 239.) This is done by Mary, for she repeats Jesus to us. All this has been to illustrate but one of the many wonderful themes threaded through this work.

One final practical note—the points for meditation are always placed at the very end of each discourse. Each discourse is left as a whole to run its course. Many a modern meditation book is marred by breaking up the matter and suggesting points in the course of the discourses. This is a book full of merit—we owe a debt of gratitude to Bishop Hedley. By careful application it will prove its usefulness—the usefulness of real Christian fare for any soul who wants to pray.

P.W.

*

*

*

*

CATHOLIC POLITICAL THOUGHT: 1789-1848, by Bela Menczer. London, 1952. Burns Oates. Price, 18/-. 205 ps.

The World Revolution of to-day is traced by historians to the European Revolution, which, for convenience sake, can be fixed at 1848, and the French Revolution of 1789. And the great debate of to-day, Democracy versus Totalitarianism, had its counterpart in those times in the controversy over Monarchy and Democracy. To turn back the pages of the history of political thought to the period 1789-1848, therefore, is to review the origins of our present problem, and to see institutions other than those we know, for which men were ready to fight with pen and sword. This more than useful service has been done, if only partly, by the work under review.

The word 'partly' is justified because the thought presented repre-

sents only one school—that of those defending the old order. What is presented, however, is done well. It is representative in that it includes the efforts of French, Italian, German and Spanish thinkers. And it emphasises the unity of their thought. Bonald was the master whose influence Metternich markedly felt. The latter paid high tribute to the Spaniard Cortes, who was the inspiration of Veuillot.

Selected texts illustrate the thought of representative writers, and are presented in a very interesting context. In a long introduction, there is outlined the great debate between Authority and Liberty in the 18th and 19th Centuries. To each of the protagonists of secular liberty, there is set in turn an apologist of the Faith. The foundations of modern French Catholic thought are shown in Bossuet, who saw History as the working out of Providence, and Pascal, his contemporary, who upheld the primacy of Authority, and, therefore, loved Liberty—the liberty of man to know and love God. Voltaire was the first major defection from this teaching. He “secularised both Authority and Liberty, not admitting that either had any other foundation than human reason and human need”. This teaching received full expression in the French Revolution, and it received its answer at the hands of Joseph de Maistre. Voltaire had put the accent on morals, but separated morals from faith. De Maistre’s reply was that he could not trust the morals of anyone not prepared to make the first and most difficult moral effort, the effort to believe. De Maistre accordingly upheld authority. It was his essential thesis that man is essentially unfit to “create” anything, so that the attempt to create “new worlds”, instead of accepting the order of creation, can only lead to disaster.

Montesquieu taught the relativity of political and religious truth and first upheld the subordination of religious truth to the pragmatic aims of governments. De Bonald is presented as his counter apologist. He aimed to state absolute truth in philosophy and theology. And against Montesquieu’s well-known theory of equilibrium through the separation of powers upheld the unity of power; the unity of purpose seen in nature, and of society. Power is given for the preservation of the natural law, and society implies the primacy of Order, the framework of real Liberty.

Though the protagonists of monarchical Europe had their defects, history has justified many of their criticisms and seen the fulfillment of some of their prophecies.

NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS. Selected by a Brother of the Christian Schools. London, 1951, 56 pp. 2/6. Burns, Oates.

Any aid that is of advantage in the exposition of religious truths, of advantage either to the teacher or to the person being instructed, requires from any of us a careful consideration. The catechism is the universal means employed in religious instruction and in "New Testament Texts" we have to hand precisely such a help in this fundamental education. Here the teacher can have at his disposal a ready reckoner of Scriptural proofs on which to base his exposition of the truths of religion, and to bolster up his defence of those truths; while the pupil, if he be unable to comprehend arguments from reason, will accept without hesitation the word of God. In this small work (only 56 pages), a Brother of the Christian Schools, one cognisant with the needs of teacher and student, has collated texts from the New Testament and arranged them according to the subject matter of the catechism; the author's intention is that it is "for use with 'a catechism of Christian Doctrine'."

Not every Catechism will follow the same order in arranging the matter, but fundamentally each will contain the truths to be known and believed, the commandments to be obeyed, prayer and the virtues, and the seven sacraments. The author covers each of these groups with a fairly comprehensive number of quotations: The three theological virtues and a chapter on the creed comprise the first four chapters. It is to be noted that the commandments of God are included in the chapter headed 'charity'. "Loving God means keeping His commandments..." I John, 5.3 (cfr. P. 28). Then there follow chapters on the Commandments of the Church, the sacraments, the virtues and vices, while the two final chapters are devoted to the christian's rule of life and the christian's daily exercise—frequent references to which are found in the New Testament, particularly among the writings of St. Paul.

The author has confined himself to the New Testament as the source from which to derive his texts. This restriction which the author has placed upon himself is worthy of commendation, especially when one keeps in mind that Catechetical instruction is primarily the instruction of the young. Now that part of Sacred Scripture with which even the young are familiar is the New Testament, containing as it does the life story of Christ. And frequently enough the text quoted will be the very words of Christ Himself, words bound to give authority to the explanations of the instructor and assurance to the seeker of truth.

The text used is the version of Mons. Ronald Knox. The advantages or disadvantages of using this version in preference to others will vary according to the tastes of the individual readers.

Teacher, preacher and those receiving instruction will find this small work helpful in placing their exposition and acquisition of the truths of religion on a sure foundation—the Word of God.

H.B.

*

*

*

*

MATTER, MAN, AND MIRACLE. By Henry P. Newsholme. Burns, Oates. Pages IX + 107. Price, 8/6.

Flip these pages beneath your thumb and, like as not, one word will catch the eye by its frequent appearance. *Inertia* is the word, and it is so continually under the spotlight that the author is well justified in remarking "that this in a sense will be a one-track book". But there is variety also, for it is not a work on physics, but the examination of a quality common to all beings we know, viz., "persistence in activity or in non-activity". To this quality is given the name of inertia. All creation is examined insofar as it has this inertia, and the ideal state is found in an inertial balance, in a harmony of activity and non-activity. Evil, functional habits of body and spirit, and also miracles are defined in terms of a swing away from this balance. These definitions then become a basis for speculation.

The treatment of evil is a very interesting one, particularly in the importance it gives to the evil in creatures below man. The author apparently does not think the usual answers sufficient to explain all physical evil. He sees a lopsidedness brought into the inertial balance of the world so that each part no longer fits neatly into the whole. The responsibility for this is placed with the fallen angels. An interesting corollary to this theory is found in the idea of miracles. They are now seen as passing restorations by God of the original balance, so that, in a particular case, lesser creatures bend their whole being to the good of the whole.

All this is plausible, if unproved, but the rest of the book suffers from a certain thinness. In these days of exhaustive experiment, any reflections on functions of mind or body which do not refer continually to known facts must fail fully to convince. This would apply to some extent even in a discussion of diabolic influence in insanity, while in the question of the will's influence on bodily functions or human personality,

facts become all important. It is true the author often hints there is such a factual basis, but he doesn't produce it. His whole interest is in giving his theories in terms of inertia. Even so, his little book is worth reading completely, for its method is certainly interesting, and the speculations all provoke thought.

B.J.

*

*

*

*

ADVENT. By Jean Daniélou (trans. by Rosemary Sheed). Sheed & Ward. Pages 181. Price 8/6.

These days there are many books to teach us that the Church is a living thing, but few of them treat this life in a living manner. We learn of it, but do not feel it. Here, under the misleading title of *Advent*, is a very noticeable exception to the common rule. It considers the Church as a missionary force and does it with an originality and vigour that never flags. And this means, of course, it is interesting from start to finish.

Père Daniélou begins with the problem of the non-Christian religions. They cannot be simply condemned as evil, for much of outstanding goodness is to be found in them. What is their relation to Catholicism? A study of the Old Testament gives the way to an answer by showing how carefully and continually God prepared for the coming of Christ. The Holy Spirit's influence can be seen everywhere: in the natural religion which opened the way for the covenant with Abraham and, particularly, in this covenant itself. The Jews were a chosen people, but they were chosen with an end in view. The Christ was rejected because they would not recognise the true nature of their mission. They refused to see that all this was to finish in a new dispensation which involved the destruction of Judaism as they knew it. Unlike the Baptist, they refused to decrease. In the great pagan religions still existing to-day the author sees a similar situation. Under the special guidance of the angels, these religions were preparing for the coming of Christ's message. But again the urge to survival has triumphed, and they remain as enemies of the truth for which they were precursors.

This summary barely gives the foundations of a book which is remarkable for its richness. Père Daniélou covers a large part of missionary theology. He considers the place of the Passion, the Resurrection, Our Blessed Mother, and the angels. He shows how truly

Christ's Church is a missionary church, ever working to finish its task. The study of non-Christian religions gives us a way to their conversion through the preparations already divinely made in them, and also points to the qualities necessary in a servant of Christ. Most important of all, the basis of the whole, he stresses the presence of the Holy Spirit acting without break in every part of history, but particularly in the progress of the Church. Throughout, what is practical is seen in the light of the Divine, what is supernatural is viewed with an eye to practice. As a missionary church must be made up of missionary members, this is a work of value to all who love God.

B.J.